



2025:DHC:9565-DB



\$~1

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 8259/2016

S.K. SINGHAL .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.S. Tiwari, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Ansari, Sr.  
PC for UOI

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.HARI SHANKAR**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL**

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**31.10.2025**

%

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J.**

**CM APPL. 35440/2025 (exemption)**

1. Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**CM APPL. 35439/2025 (additional documents)**

3. The present application has been filed by the petitioner seeking leave of this Court to place on record a document stated to have not been in his possession at the time of filing of the writ petition.
4. It is contended that the said document is material to the petitioner's case and could not be filed earlier despite due diligence.



2025:DHC:9565-DB



5. The explanation tendered by the petitioner for non-production of the document at the earlier stage does not inspire confidence. Permitting introduction of new material at this stage, would, in effect, amount to reopening of the concluded proceedings, which is impermissible in law.

6. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to allow the present application. The same is, accordingly, dismissed.

#### **REVIEW PET. 341/2025**

7. The present review petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking review of the judgment dated 10.02.2025 passed by this Court in the captioned petition. The petitioner seeks review of the said judgment on various grounds, inter alia, alleging that this Court failed to appreciate certain procedural irregularities and documentary evidence placed on record.

8. The principal grounds urged in support of the review petitioner are that:

- (i) the procedure prescribed under Rule 29(3) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965, mandating opportunity of hearing prior to enhancement of penalty, was not followed;
- (ii) the petitioner's reliance on Rule 36A of the SB Postal Vol.-I was not considered;



2025:DHC:9565-DB



- (iii) the death certificate dated 28.02.2005, along with affidavit of the deceased's wife confirming death on 20.01.2005, was overlooked;
- (iv) the death certificate relied upon by the respondents stood discredited by the issuing authority;
- (v) the respondent's certificate was never formally proved;
- (vi) the petitioner was denied opportunity to cross-examine Shri Ram Nath; and
- (vii) the allegation of misappropriation of Rs. 10,50,850 was never part of the charge sheet and the corresponding FIR stood closed on 12.09.2008.

**9.** Upon perusal of the impugned judgment dated 10.02.2025, it is evident that all the issues now sought to be re-agitated were duly considered and dealt with by this Court. This Court had specifically recorded findings that the disagreement note issued by the Disciplinary Authority was tentative and in conformity with law; that the Director Postal Services was competent to exercise revisional jurisdiction under Rule 29(1)(v) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965; and that the death certificate relied upon by the department had been duly verified by the competent authorities. The punishment of dismissal from service was also held to be proportionate to the gravity of misconduct established.

**10.** It is trite law that the scope of review is extremely limited. A review cannot be entertained to re-hear or re-assess evidence already appreciated, nor to substitute a different view on the same material.



2025:DHC:9565-DB



Unless an error apparent on the face of the record is shown, which is manifest and self-evident, a review cannot be maintained.

**11.** Under the garb of filing a review petition, a party cannot be permitted to repeat or reagitate the arguments duly considered in the impugned judgment.

**12.** The petitioner has failed to point out any such error apparent on the face of the record or omission that would warrant interference under the review jurisdiction of this Court. The grounds raised are, in essence, a repetition of arguments already urged and rejected on merits in the judgment under review.

**13.** Hence, no ground of review of the judgment dated 10.02.2025 is made out. Accordingly, the Review Petition is devoid of merits and is dismissed.

**14.** The pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**AJAY DIGPAUL, J.**

**C. HARI SHANKAR, J.**

**OCTOBER 31, 2025/AR**