

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Review Petition No. 70 of 2015

Haridas Vaishnav, S/o. Late Mohandas Vaishnav, Aged About 46 Years,
Agriculturist Village Darra Bandha, Tahsil Dongergaon, Occupation Clerk,
B.N.C. Mills Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Ritika Das, D/o. Haridas Vaishnav, Aged About 23 Years, W/o. Vinod
Kumar, S/o. Mathura Prasad Sharma, R/o. Lakholi Ward Rajnandgaon,
Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr. V.K.Sharma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

21/08/2015

1. The instant review petition has been preferred on the ground that the evidence which is on record has not been considered by the Court in its proper perspective.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the suit property over which the house is existing was constructed by the appellant though it was in name of one Krishna Kumari Das. He further submits that when the house was constructed, the suit property was in name of Haridas Vaishnav, therefore, the title of Smt. Ritika Das cannot be held.
3. I have again perused the order and the documents as also the order dated 06.07.2015 passed by this Court. While evaluating the evidence, the Court has held that the suit property was in exclusive

name of Radharani, the mother of the plaintiff namely Smt. Ritika Das. Apparently there is no challenge to the same. The oral statement however have been made against such registered document. Considering the same, the oral statement as against the registered document was not considered.

4. Reading of the review petition would go to show that nothing has been substantiated that the petitioner came to know of discovery of new important facts or evidence, which was not within the knowledge of the applicant, consequently, could not be placed at the time of earlier hearing. The case is also not to the like nature that certain facts were not in knowledge of the petitioner on account of some mistake and error apparent from the order, the review can be sought.
5. Consequently, after due consideration of the review petition, in my opinion, no case for review of the order dated 06.07.2015 is made out. In the result, the review petition is dismissed having no merit.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge