
(2019) 01 CAT CK 0103

In the Central Administrative Tribunal

Case No : Review Application No. 5 Of 2019, Original Application No. 1385 Of 2017

Nikka Ram Verma

APPELLANT

Vs

Union Of India And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 09-01-2019

Acts Referred:

Administrative Tribunal Act, 1985 — Section 22(3)(f)
Code Of Civil Procedure, 1908 — Section 114, Order 47 Rule 1
Railway Services (Pension) Rules, 1993 — Rule 15, 16
Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1972 — Rule 62, 63, 73
Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2019) 01 CAT CK 0103

Hon'ble Judges : Nita Chowdhury, Member (A)

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Lalta Prasad

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. The present Review Application is filed by the Review Applicant seeking review of the Order dated 28.9.2018 passed in OA 1385/2017 passed by this Court.

2. Perused the said Order under Review. The grounds taken in the present Review Application are not based on any error apparent on the face of record. However, it is relevant to mention that similar provisions as in CCS (Pension) Rules, 1965 which have been mentioned in the Order under review are also very much available in the Railway Services (Pension) Rules, 1993, which was Rules 15 and 16. In fact, the review applicant is questioning the conclusion arrived at by this Bench in the said Order. If this Court agrees to his prayer, this Court would be going into the merits of the case again and re-writing another judgment of the same case. By doing so, this Court would be acting as an appellate authority, which is not permissible in review. In the case of Aribam Tuleswar 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."

In case of State of West Bengal & Ors. Vs. Kamalsengupta & Anr. [2008(8) SCC 612], the Hon'ble Supreme Court after having considered the important decisions on the subject and defined the difference between the review and appeal, has held as follows:-

"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 of CPC.

(ii) The Tribunal can review its decision on either of the grounds enumerated in Order 47 Rule 1 and not otherwise.

(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."

3. Thus, on the basis of the above citations and observations made hereinabove, this Court comes to the conclusion that it was not open to the review applicant to question the merits of the decision taken by this Tribunal.

In fact, he could have only pointed out any error apparent on the face of record,

but no such error is pointed out in any of the grounds taken in the Review Application. However, the Rules 62, 63 and 73 of the CCS (Pension) Rules as mentioned in para 7 of the Order under review be reads as "Railway Services (Pension) Rules, 1993 were seen. The said Rules, Rules 15 and 16". Accordingly, Registry is directed to correct the same and corrected copy be issued to the applicant. As such this Review Application is devoid of merit and the same is accordingly dismissed.