

**By Circulation
E-Court No. 1**

**ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH,
LUCKNOW**

Review Application No. 43 of 2021

(Inre O.A. No. 332 of 2018)

Wednesday, this the 1st day of September, 2021

**“Hon’ble Mr. Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava (J)
Hon’ble Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve, Member (A)”**

Smt. Rita Rani, Wife of late Naik Baljit Singh (No. 9406461F),
Village- Mohabewala (Old Murgji Khana) Near Chandrabani
Chowk, Dehradun (Uttarakhand), PIN- 248002

..... Applicant

Counsel for the Applicant : **Shri Lalit Kumar, Advocate**

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary Ministry of Defence,
South Block, New Delhi – 110011.
2. The Chief Records Officer (CRO), Record Office, The 11
Gorkha Rifles, PIN- 900450, C/o 56 APO.
3. The Principal Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension),
Draupadighat, Allahabad-211014.

.....Respondents

Counsel for the Respondents : **Shri Rajesh Sharma,
Central Govt. Counsel**

ORDER

1. The applicant has filed this Review Application under Rule 18 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008. By means of this Review Application, the applicant has made prayer to set aside the impugned order dated 02.08.2021 and restore the O.A. to its original number.

2. The matter came up before us by way of Circulation as per provisions of Rule 18 (3) of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008, whereby the applicant has prayed for review of the order dated 02.08.2021 passed in O.A No. 332 of 2018 and pass a fresh and final order. In the aforesaid O.A., marriage of Smt Rita Rani with the deceased soldier was not found legal because as per Hindu Marriage Act second marriage is null and void unless there is divorce from first wife. Accordingly, her prayer for grant of family pension was rejected.

3. We have gone through the grounds and reasons indicated in the affidavit filed in support of the application and have also gone through the judgment and order sought to be reviewed. The judgment and order sought to be reviewed was passed in proper prospective after considering all the facts and circumstances. No illegality or irregularity or error apparent on the face of record has been shown to us so as to review the aforesaid judgment of this Court.

4. It is settled proposition of law that the scope of the review is limited and the applicant has to show that there is error apparent on the face of the record. For ready reference the Order 47 Rule 1 Sub Rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure is reproduced below :-

“1. Application for review of judgment.- (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 by this Code, or

(c) by a decision on a reference from a 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 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 of the Court which passed the decree or made the order.”

5. In view of the principles of law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in various decisions, it is settled that the scope of review jurisdiction is very limited and re-hearing is not permissible. Hon’ble the Supreme Court in Para 9 of its judgment in the case of **Parsion Devi and Others vs. Sumitri Devi and others** reported in (1997) 8 Supreme Court Cases 715, has observed as under :-

1. “9. Under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self evident and has to

be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power review under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be "reheard and corrected". There is a clear distinction between an erroneous decision and an error apparent on the face of the record. While the first can be corrected by the higher forum, the latter only can be corrected by exercise of the review jurisdiction. A review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be "an appeal in disguise."

6. In the instant case, the details mentioned in the review application had already been taken into consideration and discussed in detail and thereafter the order was passed. In view of the principle of law laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **Parsion Devi and Others** (supra), we are of the considered view that there is no error apparent on the face of record in the impugned order dated 02.08.2021, which may be corrected in exercise of review jurisdiction.

7. Accordingly, the Review Application No. 43 of 2021 is rejected. There shall be no order as to costs. The applicant may be informed accordingly.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve)
Member (A)

(Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (J)

Dated: 01 September, 2021
Ukt/-