

By Circulation

E. Court No. 1

ARMED FORCES TRIBUNAL, REGIONAL BENCH, LUCKNOW

Diary No 3357 of 2021 inre O.A. No 386 of 2019

Wednesday, this the 02nd day of February, 2022

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

Union of India & Others

..... Applicant

Counsel for the Applicant/
Respondents **Shri Bipin Kumar Singh,
Central Govt Counsel**

Versus

**No.6323041-L Ex Sigmn Raghu Bir Singh Negi, S/o Late
Pancham Singh, R/o Chota Talla, Post – Hanumati Via
Dugadda, Tehsil – Kot Dwar, District- Pauri Garhwal (U.K.)**

.....Respondents

Counsel for the : **Shri Sudhir Kumar Singh,
Respondent/Applicant Advocate**

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 review the judgment and order dated 07.07.2021 passed in O.A. No 386 of 2019 and grant disability pension from three years prior to filing of O.A.

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 07.07.2021 passed in O.A No. 386 of 2019 and grant disability pension from three years prior to filing of O.A. The aforesaid O.A. was allowed and the applicant was granted 20% disability element for two years from the date of discharge. The respondents were directed to refer the applicant's case to Re-survey Medical Board for further entitlement of disability pension. The respondents were further directed to comply the order within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

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 07.07.2021, which may be corrected in exercise of review jurisdiction. In addition, applicant has not removed the defects indicated by the Registry.

7. Accordingly, the Diary No. 3357 of 2021 is rejected. There shall be no order as to costs. The applicant may be informed accordingly.

(Vice Admiral Abhay Raghunath Karve) (Justice Umesh Chandra Srivastava)
Member (A) **Member (J)**

Dated: 02 February, 2022

Ukt/-