

**BY CIRCULATION**

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

**Review Application No. 03 of 2019**

**Inre:**

**T.A. No. 1285 of 2010**

Rakesh Kumar Singh (deceased) (Service No. 155696)  
son of Sri Surendra Singh.

**Through**

- 1/1. Surendra Nath s/o Doodhnath, resident of Gram-Bairath Vazidpur, District-Chandouli.
- 1/2. Nirmala Devi wife of Surendra Nath, resident of Gram-Bairath Vazidpur, District-Chandouli.
- 1/3. Anish Kumar Singh, son of Surendra Nath, resident of Gram-Bairath Vazidpur, District-Chandouli.

.....Petitioners

vs.

**Union of India & ors**

...Respondents

**Friday, this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2019**

**ORDER**

1. Review Application under Rule 18 of the Armed Forces Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 2008 has been preferred by the petitioners against judgment and order of the Armed Forces Tribunal, Regional Bench,

Lucknow dated 11.12.2018 passed in T.A. No. 1285 of 2010. The matter came up before us by way of Circulation as per provisions of Rule 18 (3) of the AFT (Procedure) Rules, 2008.

2. In the Review Application, the prayer made by the petitioners is that the order dated 11.12.2018 whereby the T.A. was dismissed be reviewed and set aside aforementioned judgment and order

3. The law on Review is well enunciated that the scope of Review is limited. The Review Application can be heard if there is an error apparent on the face of record and only to that extent order can be corrected. In connection, Order 47 Rule 1 Sub Rule (1) of the Code of Civil Procedure being relevant 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."*

4. Hon'ble Supreme Court in various decisions has clearly laid down that the scope of Review jurisdiction is very limited and re-hearing is not permissible. Hon'ble Supreme Court has drawn a clear distinction between an erroneous decision and an error apparent on the face of the record. It has been laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that while the first can be corrected by the higher forum, the latter only can be corrected by exercise of the Review jurisdiction. In the case of ***Parsion Devi and Others vs. Sumitri Devi and others***, reported in (1997) 8 SCC 715 (Para 9) of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as under:-

*"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.*

*10. While passing the impugned order, Sharma, J. found the order in Civil Revision as an erroneous decision, though without saying so in so many words. Mechanical use of statutorily sanctified phrases cannot detract from the real import of the order passed in exercise of the Review jurisdiction.*

*Recourse to Review petition in the facts and circumstances of the case was not permissible. The aggrieved judgment-debtors could have approached the higher forum through appropriate proceedings to assail the order of Gupta, J. and get it set aside but it was not open to them to seek a Review of the order of Gupta, J, on the grounds detailed in the Review petition. Therefore, the impugned order of Sharma, J. cannot be sustained."*

5. In view of the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Parsion Devi and others*** (supra), we are of the considered view that to recall an order passed after hearing both the parties on merits is beyond the scope of review jurisdiction. Such a jurisdiction vests only in appellate Court to set aside the order and decide it. Since the prayer made by the petitioners is beyond the scope of review jurisdiction, hence it deserves to be rejected.

6. Moreover, this Tribunal had dismissed the T.A. on merits on the following grounds:-

- "(a) That INS Chilka is a static formation whose primarily role is to train Naval recruits as Sailors. Hence we agree with the respondents that this is not a case of stress and strain caused by Naval service in high seas.*
- (b) Medical evidence and medical literature on the subject is clear that colour defect is constitutional in nature and is normally inherited. Since there is no history of injury to the eyes of the deceased petitioner, we tend to agree with the respondents and the opinion of IMB that the colour defect of the deceased petitioner was constitutional in nature.*
- (c) That the deceased petitioner was a recruit under training and hence he was akin to a probationer. Thus a mandatory special medical check-up applicable for all trainees within few months of training is like the extension of 1<sup>st</sup> medical and therefore prima facie, the respondents as an employer, have a right to reject a probationer who is not up to the required medical standards for Navy."*

7. As a result of foregoing discussion, the Review Application, being devoid of merit, is liable to be dismissed, hence **dismissed** accordingly.

8. The petitioners may be informed accordingly.

**(Air Marshal BBP Sinha)**  
**Member (A)**

**(Justice SVS Rathore)**  
**Member (J)**

gsr