



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JULY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

REVIEW PETITION NO. 84 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

1. THE PRINCIPAL CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS
ARANYA BHAVAN 4TH FLOOR,
MALLESHWARAM 18TH CROSS,
BANGALORE-560 003.
2. THE CHIEF CONSERVATOR OF FOREST
VANAVIKASA 4TH FLOOR, 18TH CROSS,
MALLESHWARAM,
BANGALORE-560 003.
3. THE DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS
BANGALORE URBAN DIVISION,
ARANYA BHAVANA COMPOUND,
18TH CROSS, MALLESHWARAM,
BANGALORE- 560 003.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. REUBEN JACOB, AAG A/W
SRI V SHIVAREDDY, AGA)

AND:

SRI P. JUNJAPPA
S/O LATE PERUMAPPA
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
RETIRED AS A FOREST WATCHER
OFFICER OF THE RANGE FOREST OFFICER,
ANEKAL RANGE, ANEKAL
BANGALORE URBAN DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. RANGANATHA S JOIS, ADV.)



THIS REVIEW PETITION FILED UNDER ORDER 47 RULE 1 R/W SEC. 114 OF CPC, PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS AND REVIEW AND RECALL THE IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 17.03.2025 PASSED IN WP NO.6238/2020 (S-KSAT).

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT
AND
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH RAI K

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.G.PANDIT)

Heard learned Additional Advocate General
Sri.Reuben Jacob along with learned Additional
Government Advocate Sri.V.Shivareddy for
petitioners/State and learned counsel Sri.Ranganath S.
Jois for respondent. Perused the entire review petition
papers.

2. The above review petition is filed under Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to review order dated 17.03.2025 in W.P.No.6238/2020, whereunder, the respondents are directed to consider the petitioner's case for regularization in accordance with the principles laid down in the case of



STATE OF KARNATAKA AND OTHERS VS. M.L.KESARI AND OTHER¹

and other applicable judgments with an observation that the petitioner shall be entitled to all consequential monetary benefits including arrears of pay as per the doctrine of 'equal pay for equal work'.

3. Learned Additional Advocate General Sri.Reuben Jacob in addition to the grounds raised in the review petition submitted that the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court wrongly applied the ratio of **SECRETARY, STATE OF KARNATAKA AND OTHERS VS. UMADEVI (3) AND OTHERS²** and **M.L.KESARI** (supra) to the facts of the present case and as such, the order needs to be reviewed. Further, learned Additional Advocate General would submit that the respondent joined as a daily wager on 10.01.1983 and subsequently he was granted benefits under the Karnataka Daily Wage Employees Welfare Act, 2012. He attained the age of superannuation and on his superannuation, he was granted ex-gratia of Rs.8,00,000/-. Therefore, he submits

¹ (2010) 9 SCC 247

² (2006) 4 SCC 1



that the respondent would not be entitled for regularization. Hence, he would pray for review of the order dated 17.03.2025 in W.P.No.6238/2020.

4. Learned counsel Sri.Ranganath S. Jois for respondent would submit that there is no error apparent on the face of the record. As such, review petition is liable to be rejected. Further, learned counsel would submit that wrong application of the judgment would not be a ground to review. Further, he would submit that the grounds raised by the petitioners-State Government are not the grounds for review and review petition cannot be treated as an appeal to consider the grounds raised by the petitioners-State. Thus, he would pray for dismissal of the review petition.

5. Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and on perusal of the entire review petition papers, we do not find any error on the face of the record to review order dated 17.03.2025 in W.P.No.6238/2020.



6. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **SANJAY KUMAR AGARWAL VS. STATE TAX OFFICER (1) AND ANOTHER**³ has held that a review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be an appeal in disguise. Under the guise of review, petitioner cannot be permitted to re-agitate and reargue the questions which have already been addressed and decided. It is also held that even an erroneous decision cannot be re-heard or corrected under the review jurisdiction. The main contention of the learned Additional Advocate General for petitioners-State is that the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court applied **UMADEVI** (supra) and **M.L.KESARI** (supra) wrongly to the facts of the present case. A wrong or erroneous application of a judgment cannot be a ground to review an order. Moreover, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, on the face of it, it cannot be said that **UMADEVI** (supra) and **M.L.KESARI** (supra) are wrongly applied.

³ (2024) 2 SCC 362



7. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **SANJAY KUMAR AGARWAL** (supra) at paragraph 10 has held as follows:

"10. It is also well-settled that a party is not entitled to seek a review of a judgment delivered by this Court merely for the purpose of a rehearing and a fresh decision of the case. The normal principle is that a judgment pronounced by the Court is final, and departure from that principle is justified only when circumstances of a substantial and compelling character make it necessary to do so. [Sajjan Singh v. State of Rajasthan, 1964 SCC OnLine SC 25 : AIR 1965 SC 845]"

8. We do not find any error apparent on the face of the record so as to review order dated 17.03.2025 in W.P.No.6328/2020. Accordingly, review petition stands rejected.

**Sd/-
(S.G.PANDIT)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(RAJESH RAI K)
JUDGE**

NC
CT:bms