

**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH: NEW DELHI**

R.A. No.49 of 2018
IN
O.A. No.4208 of 2016

This the 30th day of August, 2019

**Hon'ble Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)
Hon'ble Mr. S.N. Terdal, Member (J)**

Shri Ved Prakash Gupta, 72 yrs. Retired J.E. (El.)
S/o Shri Kunj Lal Gupta,
C-770, J.V.T.S. Garden, Chhatterpur Exn.,
New Delhi

....Review Applicant
(Applicant in person)

VERSUS

1. Union of India through
Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.
2. Secretary, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and
Pensions (Division of Retaining and Redeployment),
New Delhi-110001.
3. The Director General of Works, CPWD,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi-110011.
4. The Accounts Officer,
M/o Urban Development,
Internal Audit Wing, 507-C, Nirman Bhawan,
New Delhi-110011.
5. The Executive Engineer (Elec.), CPWD,
E.C.D.-5, Pushpa Bhawan,
New Delhi-110062.

.....Review Respondents

(By Advocate : Shri U. Srivastava)

O R D E R (Oral)

Ms. Nita Chowdhury, Member (A):

Heard review applicant in person and Shri U. Srivastava, learned counsel for the review respondents.

2. The present Review Application is filed by the Review Applicant seeking review of the Order dated 6.2.2018 passed in OA 4208/2016 by the Division Bench of this Tribunal. The operative part of the said Order reads as under:-

“5. We have heard both the parties and perused the material on record. We have examined the DOPT OM dated 27.02.1985 regarding re-deployment of surplus staff of Beas Construction Project and also the appointment letter given to the applicant. We find that the appointment letter is passed according to the terms and conditions issued by the Government. The posting of surplus staff will be effective from the date they join the work. Their past seniority will not be accepted in the new job and they will be first placed on probation and only after confirmation on satisfactory 5 OA No.4208/2016 completion of probation they will get future service benefits of the new job they have joined.

6. In fact, this particular clause no.23 in appointment order makes it clear that after deployment from the surplus cell the applicant was treated on probation for two years with the further proviso to extend the probation by the appointing authority and if the probation is not satisfactorily completed as per the satisfaction of the competent authority, the concerned officer can be removed from service. Hence, the stand of the respondents that they have given the 1st ACP to the applicant after completion of 12 years of service and that he was not entitled for 2nd ACP as he retired on 31.12.2004 before the completion of 24 years of service which is the requirement for award of 2nd ACP, is found to be correct application and interpretation of the said rules. In the circumstances, we do not find any merit in this OA and the same is dismissed. No order as to costs.

3. We have perused the said Order under Review as well as the Review Application. The grounds taken in the present

Review Application are not based on any error apparent on the face of record. In fact, the review applicant is questioning the conclusion arrived at by this Bench in the said Order. If we agree to his prayer, we would be going into the merits of the case again and re-writing another judgment of the same case. By doing so, we would be acting as an appellate authority, which is not permissible in review. In the case of ***Aribam Tuleshwar Sharma vs. Aribam Pishak Sharma***, [AIR 1979 SC 1047], the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as follows:-

"It is true as observed by this Court in *Shivdeo Singh v. State of Punjab*, AIR 1963 SC 1909, there is nothing in Article 226 of the Constitution to preclude a High Court from exercising the power of review which is inherent in every Court of plenary jurisdiction to prevent miscarriage of justice or to correct grave and palpable errors committed by it. But, there are definitive limits to the exercise of the power of review. The power of review may be exercised on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking the review or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made; it may be exercised where some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found; it may also be exercised on any analogous ground. But, it may not be exercised on the ground that the decision was erroneous on merits. That would be the province of a Court of appeal. A power of review is not to be confused with appellate power which may enable an Appellate Court to correct all matters or errors committed by the Subordinate Court."

Again in the case of ***Ajit Kumar Rath vs. State of Orissa and others***, 1999 (9) SCC 596, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as follows:-

"The provisions extracted above indicate that the power of review available to the Tribunal is the same as has been given to a court under Section 114 read with Order 47 CPC. The power is not absolute and is hedged in by the restrictions indicated in Order 47. The power can be exercised on the application of a person on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made. The power can also be exercised on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or for any other sufficient reason. 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. **It may be pointed out that the expression "any other sufficient reason" used in Order 47 Rule 1 means a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule.**

Any 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."

[Emphasis added]

In the case of ***Gopal Singh vs. State Cadre Forest Officers' Assn. and others***, (2007 (9) SCC 369), the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:-

"The learned counsel for the State also pointed out that there was no necessity whatsoever on the part of the Tribunal to review its own judgment. Even after the microscopic examination of the judgment of the Tribunal we could not find a single reason in the whole judgment as to how the review was justified and for what reasons. No apparent error on the face of the record was pointed, nor was it discussed. Thereby the

Tribunal sat as an appellate authority over its own judgment. This was completely impermissible and we agree with the High Court (Justice Sinha) that the Tribunal has traveled out of its jurisdiction to write a second order in the name of reviewing its own judgment. In fact the learned counsel for the appellant did not address us on this very vital aspect."

4. Thus, on the basis of the above citations and observations made hereinabove, we come to the conclusion that it was not open to the review applicant to question the decision taken by this Tribunal. In fact, he could have only pointed out any error apparent on the face of record, which has not been done in any of the grounds taken in the Review Application rather the review applicant in the garb of present review application is trying to re-argue the whole case, which is not permissible in view of the aforesaid observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. As such this Review Application is devoid of merit and the same is accordingly dismissed.

5. All pending MA(s) also stand disposed of.

(S.N. Terdal)
Member (J)

(Nita Chowdhury)
Member (A)

/ravi/