

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
CHANDIGARH BENCH**

...

**R.A. No.60/46/2018 IN
O.A. No.60/493/2017**

Date of decision: 04.12.2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J).

...

Jai Dev, aged about 62 years S/o Sh. Devi Dayal, former Hospital Engineer (Executive Engineer) (Electrical), Department of Hospital Engineering and Planning, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, R/o #3299, Sargodha Co-Op. H.B. society, Sector 50 D, Chandigarh. Pin Code-160047, Group-A.

**...APPLICANT
VERSUS**

1. Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education & Research, Sector-12, Chandigarh through its Director, Pin Code 160012.
2. The Financial Adviser cum Chief Accountant, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education & Research, Sector-12, Chandigarh, Pin Code 160012.

...RESPONDENTS

PRESENT: Sh. Rujhan Dhawan vice Ms. Nidhi Singla, counsel for the applicant.

ORDER (Oral)

...

SANJEEV KAUSHIK, MEMBER (J):-

1. Present R.A. has been filed under Rule 22(3)(f) read with order 47 Rule 1 of CPC seeking review of order dated 09.04.2018 passed by this Court in O.A. No.60/493/2017.
2. Heard Sh. Rujhan Dhawan. Learned counsel for the applicant was not able to point out any factual error apparent on record which can be a ground for review under Rule 22(3)(f) read with order 47 Rule

1 of CPC. Under the garb of present R.A. the applicants want to re-argue the matter all over again and raise those very pleas which have already been considered and negated by this Court while delivering the judgment. The plea taken by him does not fall within the limited scope of review under Order XLVII, Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 read with the provisions of Section 22(3) 1 (f) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

3. We cannot sit as appellate authority over the orders passed earlier by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Tribunal itself. What Court can do is only to correct or rectify a factual mistake, if the same is apparent on the face of the record. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Inderchand Jain (dead) through LRs Versus Moti Lal (dead) through LRs** (2009 (14) S.C.C. page 663) has held that "*such an application for review would be maintainable not only upon discovery of a new and important piece of evidence or when there exists an error apparent on the face of the record but also if the same is necessitated on account of some mistake or for any other sufficient reason*" which elements are lacking in this case. As such no review of the order in question is required.
4. In view thereof, the present Review Application is dismissed.

**(SANJEEV KAUSHIK)
MEMBER (J)**

Date: 04.12.2018.
Place: Chandigarh.

'KR'