

**LIBRARY**  
CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA BENCH  
KOLKATA

O.A. 980/2011

Date 10-03-2016

Present : Hon'ble Mr Justice Vishnu Chandra Gupta, Judicial Member  
Hon'ble Ms Jaya Das Gupta, Administrative Member

Sri Bimal Sarma

...Applicant

-Vs-

Union of India & ors. (KVS)

.....Respondents

For the petitioner : Mr C. Sinha, Counsel

For the respondents : Mr T.K. Biswas, Counsel

**ORDER(ORAL)**

**JUSTICE V. C. GUPTA, JM:**

Heard both sides. On perusal of the allegation made in this O.A. it is clear that that

O.A.1613/2010 was filed before this Tribunal was disposed of by an order dated 21.6.2011,

which is being extracted herein below :

"Mr R.S.Banerjee Ld. Counsel for the applicant and Mr T.K.Biswas, Ld. Counsel for the respondent are present.

The Hon'ble Kolkata High Court in WPCT No. 310 of 2008 has held that this Tribunal lacks jurisdiction to consider the matter relating to Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan.

In view of the aforesaid decision copies of the OA are returned to the applicant for production before proper forum after retaining one copy for record purposes.

The O.A is disposed of no order as to costs."

After passing this order in spite of challenging the same the applicant filed another O.A seeking the same reliefs on the ground that by a subsequent judgment the Tribunal shall have jurisdiction with regard to matter of employees of Kendriya Vidyalaya and on that score he wants to pursue this O.A. It is not in dispute that the order passed in the earlier O.A dismissing



the same on the ground of jurisdiction has become final in between the parties. If the Tribunal now again entertain this application then it will amounts to reviewing its own order which has been earlier passed in O.A.1613/2010 dated 21.06.2011. Provisions contained in Order 47 Rule 1 CPC in such a situation is applicable. The relevant provision of Order XLVII Rule 1 CPC which are applicable in the matter of review before this Tribunal is re-produced below :

"R. 1. (1) Any person considering himself aggrieved –

- (a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,
- (b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or
- (c) by a decision on a reference from a [K] Court of Small Causes,

and who from 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 decree was passed or order was made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order.

(2) A party who is not appealing from a decree or order may apply for a review of judgment notwithstanding the pendency of an appeal by some other party except where the ground of such appeal is common to the applicant and the appellant, or when, being respondent, he can present to the Appellate Court the case of which he applies for the review.

[Explanation.- The fact that the decision on a question of law on which the judgment of the Court is based has been reversed or modified by the subsequent decision of a superior Court in any other case, shall not be a ground for the review of such judgment.]"

The change or review of the judgment on the basis of a subsequent decision would not be a ground for review of such judgment and in view of this legal impediment the application cannot be entertained and liable to be dismissed as such.

2. O.A is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

(Jaya Das Gupta )  
Administrative Member

Justice V.C.Gupta  
Judicial Member