



CGHC010175552026



2026:CGHC:41698-DB

RUCHI
YADAV Digitally
signed by
RUCHI
YADAV

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 143 of 2026

1 - Homendra Kumar Sahu S/o Late Ramhan Sahu, Aged About 32 Years R/o Village Surra, P.S. And Tehsil- Gurur, District Balod (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - Smt. Umeshwari Sahu W/o Homendra Kumar Sahu Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Bagatrai P.S. And Tesil-Gurur, District Balod (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Kumrani, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. B.P. Singh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput
Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

Sachin Singh Rajput, J.

25.09.2026

1. Heard on I.A. No. 01/2026 which is an application for condonation of delay of 108 days in filing the present review petition.
2. Upon due consideration and for the reasons assigned in the application, we are of the considered opinion that sufficient cause has

been shown in the application and accordingly, I.A. No. 1 of 2026 is allowed and the delay of 108 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

3. The present review petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking review of the order dated 04.12.2025 passed by this Court in F.A.(MAT) No. 287 of 2024.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the judgment dated 04.12.2025, insofar as it relates to the award of permanent alimony of Rs.10,00,000/-, has been passed without properly considering the petitioner's actual financial capacity and source of income. It is submitted that the petitioner is a rural resident having uncertain and fluctuating income from a small-scale Huller Mill and Atta Chakki and has no permanent salaried employment, substantial savings or liquid assets. He further submits that payment of the aforesaid amount within four months would cause grave financial hardship to the petitioner and would compel him either to borrow money at high interest or dispose of ancestral property. It is further submitted that the income and earning capacity of the non-applicant/wife, who is stated to be gainfully employed, have also not been adequately considered while determining the permanent alimony. He, therefore, prays that the amount of permanent alimony be suitably reconsidered in the interest of justice.
5. Learned counsel for the respondent opposes the petition and submits that the amount of permanent alimony has been awarded after considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the financial capacity of the petitioner. He submits that no sufficient ground is made

out for reconsideration or reduction of the amount awarded and, therefore, prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the grounds raised by the petitioner in the present review petition essentially seek reconsideration of the matter on merits. The petitioner had sufficient opportunity to raise all such grounds at the time of hearing of the appeal and the same were duly considered and dealt with in the judgment sought to be reviewed. It is well settled that the jurisdiction of review is limited and cannot be exercised for rehearing the matter or re-appreciating the evidence on merits, as an appeal in disguise. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record or any other ground warranting exercise of the review jurisdiction. Therefore, no case for interference with the judgment dated 04.12.2025 is made out.
8. Consequently, the review petition, being devoid of any ground warranting interference, is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge