

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, JABALPUR BENCH**  
**CIRCUIT SITTING : INDORE**

**1. REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 201/00022/2018**

(in MA No.201/00412/2014)

**&**

**2. REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 201/00023/2018**

(in MA No.201/00225/2015)

Indore, this Tuesday, the 07<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018

**HON'BLE MR.NAVIN TANDON, ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBER**

**HON'BLE MR.RAMESH SINGH THAKUR, JUDICIAL MEMBER**

A.K. Sarkar, S/o Late Shri Nripendra Nath Sarkar,  
Aged 50 years, Scientific Assistant/F,  
Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology,  
Indore, r/o D-46/3, RRCAT Colony,  
Indore – 452013 (MP)

**-Common Applicant in both RAs**

**(Applicant in person)**

**V e r s u s**

1. Union of India through Secretary,  
Department of Atomic Energy, Anushakti Bhawan,  
CSM Marg, Mumbai – 400001.

2. Director, Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology,  
Sukhniwas, PO : CAT, Indore – 452013 (MP).

3. Dr. P.D. Gupta, Former Director,  
R.R.C.A.T., Indore – 452013 (MP).

4. Shri J.K. Mittal, Former Head,  
Laser System Engineering Division (L.S.E.D.),  
RRCAT, R/o – 28, Parmanu Nagar, Near Rajendra Nagar,  
CAT – Rau Road, Indore – 452013 (MP).

5. Shri S.V. Nakhe, Scientific Officer/H,  
Laser System Engineering Section (L.S.E.S),  
R.R.C.A.T., Indore – 452013 (MP).

6. Shri Piyush Saxena, Scientific Officer/G,  
Laser Electronics Support Division, R.R.C.A.T.,  
Indore – 452013 (MP)

**- Respondents**

**COMMON ORDER****By Ramesh Singh Thakur, JM-**

These Review Applications have been filed by the applicant to review the common order dated 15.03.2018 passed by this Tribunal in Miscellaneous Applications No.201/412/2014 and No.201/225/2015, whereby the Tribunal has dismissed these MAs.

**2.** Relevant paragraphs of the common order dated 15.03.2018 passed by this Tribunal in Miscellaneous Applications No. 201/412/2014 and No 201/225/2018 read thus:

“**12.** Regarding the objection in MA No.201/00225/2015 filed by the applicant on the ground that Government of India has not authorized Shri K. Ramesh to file reply on behalf of the Government of India, in view of the observations made herein above, such allegations are also baseless, which have been put-forth by the applicant.

**13.** Resultantly, both the MA Nos.201/412/2014 & 201/225/2015 are devoid of any merit and the same are dismissed with cost of Rs.2,000/-, which shall be paid by the applicant to the CAT Bar Association, Jabalpur, within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order”.

**3.** Now, the applicant has filed the present review applications on the ground that the Tribunal has not considered the submissions made by him in aforementioned Misc.Applications.

**4.** Heard the applicant in person and carefully perused the order sought to be reviewed as well as aforementioned Misc. Applications.

5. It may be noted that scope of review under the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 of Civil Procedure Code, which provision is analogous to Section 22 (3) (f) of Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 is very limited.

6. The power of review available to this Tribunal is the same as has been given to a Court under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code. The apex court has clearly stated in **Ajit Kumar Rath Vs. State of Orissa and others**, (1999) 9 SCC 596 that: “a review cannot be claimed or asked for merely for a fresh hearing or arguments or correction of an erroneous view taken earlier, that is to say, the power of review can be exercised only for correction of a patent error of law or fact which stares in the face without any elaborate argument being needed for establishing it”. This Tribunal can not review its order unless the error is plain and apparent. It has clearly been further held by the apex court in the said case that: “[A]ny other attempt, except an attempt to correct an apparent error or an attempt not based on any ground set out in Order 47, would amount to an abuse of the liberty given to the Tribunal under the Act to review its judgment”.

7. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of **Meera Bhanja (Smt.) Vs. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury (Smt.)**, (1995)1 SCC 170 referring to certain earlier judgments, observed that an error apparent on the face of record must be such an error which must strike one on mere looking at the record. An error which has to be established by a long-drawn process

of reasoning on points where there may conceivably be two opinions can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record. Where an alleged error is far from self-evident and if it can be established, it has to be established by lengthy and complicated arguments, such an error can not be cured in a review proceeding.

8. It is also settled principle of law that the Tribunal cannot act as an appellate court for reviewing the original order. This proposition of law is supported by the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Union of India Vs. Tarit Ranjan Das**, 2004 SCC (L&S) 160 wherein their lordships have held as under:

“The scope for review is rather limited and it is not permissible for the forum hearing the review application to act as an appellate authority in respect of the original order by a fresh order and *rehearing of the matter to facilitate a change of opinion on merits*. The Tribunal seems to have transgressed its jurisdiction in dealing with the review petition as if it was hearing an original application”.

9. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matters of **State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamal Sengupta and another**, (2008)2 SCC (L&S) 735 scanned various earlier judgments and summarized the principle laid down therein, which reads thus:

“35. The principles which can be culled out from the above-noted judgments are:

(i) The power of the Tribunal to review its order/decision under Section 22(3)(f) of the Act is akin/ analogous to the power of a civil court under Section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC.

- (ii) The Tribunal can review its decision on either of the grounds enumerated in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC.
- (iii) The expression “any other sufficient reason” appearing in Order 47 Rule 1 has to be interpreted in the light of other specified grounds.
- (iv) An error which is not self-evident and which can be discovered by a long process of reasoning, cannot be treated as an error apparent on the face of record justifying exercise of power under Section 22(3)(f).
- (v) An erroneous order/ decision cannot be corrected in the guise of exercise of power of review.
- (vi) A decision/order cannot be reviewed under Section 22(3)(f) on the basis of subsequent decision/judgment of a coordinate or larger Bench of the tribunal or of a superior court.
- (vii) While considering an application for review, the tribunal must confine its adjudication with reference to material which was available at the time of initial decision. The happening of some subsequent event or development cannot be taken note of for declaring the initial order/decision as vitiated by an error apparent.
- (viii) Mere discovery of new or important matter or evidence is not sufficient ground for review. The party seeking review has also to show that such matter or evidence was not within its knowledge and even after the exercise of due diligence, the same could not be produced before the court/tribunal earlier.”

10. In the instant case we find that the applicant has simply filed some new document in support of his claim, without submitting that the said document was not available with him at the time of disposal of the Original Application. It is settled law that an error which has to be established by a long-drawn process of reasoning on points where there may conceivably be two opinions can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record warranting review of the order (See- **Meera Bhanja**’s case (supra)).

**11.** In the instant Review Applications, no error apparent on the face of record as such has been pointed out by the applicant, warranting review of the order, in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforementioned cases. Thus, the present Review Applications are misconceived and are liable to be dismissed.

**12.** In the result, both the Review Applications are dismissed.

**(Ramesh Singh Thakur)**  
**Judicial Member**

**(Navin Tandon)**  
**Administrative Member**

*rkv*