

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Review Petition No. 142 of 2015**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Labour Administrative Reforms & Training Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The superintending Engineer, PWD, Champa Division, Champa, Distt. Janjgir Champa (CG).
3. The Executive Engineer, PWD, Champa Division, Champa, Distt. Janjgir Champa (CG).
4. The Divisional Joint Director, Treasury, Accounts and Pension, Bilaspur Division, Bilaspur (CG).

---- Petitioners**Versus**

- Tiharu Ram Sahu S/o late Daras Ram Sahu, aged about 64 years, R/o Village Tanaud, Teh. Pamgarh, PS Sivrinarayan, District Janjgir Champa (CG).

---- Respondent

For Petitioners/State Shri B Gopa Kumar, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P.Sam Koshy**Order On Board****04/12/2015**

1. IA No.1 of 2015 application for condonation of delay in filing the review petition is allowed and delay is condoned.
2. The present review petition has been filed seeking review of order dated 20.04.2015 passed in Writ Petition (S) No. 907 of 2013.
3. The judgment against which review is sought is no longer res-integra for the

reason that identical issue has already been decided by the Division Bench of this court in Writ Appeal No.1073 of 2012 and wherein also the Petitioners/State had filed a review petition which was subsequently dismissed, and thus, the judgment passed by the Division Bench in identical matter i.e. Writ Appeal No.1073 of 2012 fortifies the order dated 20.04.2015 passed by this court against which review has been sought. Even otherwise, the ground of challenge raised by the Petitioners in the instant review petition are beyond the scope and ambit of review jurisdiction of this court.

4. The review petitioners, in the course of review application, are trying to re-hearing of the entire matter based on certain documents/circulars/orders etc. which were either not produced or were not relied upon at the time of hearing of original writ petition itself. It is well settled law that fresh grounds and plea cannot be permitted to be raised in the course of review jurisdiction. Moreover, a perusal of order passed in writ petition would reflect that it has been passed with due appreciation and consideration of facts by the State counsel and as such it cannot be said that there was any error apparent on the face of record. Review jurisdiction is not an Appeal in disguise. It does not permit re-hearing of matter on merits.
5. Re-appreciation of the facts of the case and passing of fresh order by exercising the review petition is not permissible under law. It is well settled principles of law that the review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. 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 of review. The jurisdiction under review does not permit an erroneous decision to be reheard and corrected.

The mistake apparent on record means that the mistake which is self evident, needs no search and satres at its face.

6. Principle of law to entertain review petition is well settled in catena of decisions one of latest being 2012(7)SCC 200 (Haryana State Industrial Development Corporation Limited vs. Mawasi and Others). Similar view has also been taken by the Supreme Court in cases of *Smt. Meera Bhanja vs. Smt. Nirmala Kumari Choudhary*¹, *Lily Thomas, etc. vs. Union of India and others*², *Ajit Kumar Rath vs. State of Orissa and others*³, *Government of T.N. and others vs. M. Ananchu Asari and others*⁴ and *Kerla State Electricity Board vs. Hitech Electrothermics & Hydropower Ltd. and others*⁵.
7. Thus, applying the above well settled principles of law to the facts of the present case, there is no ground available for review of the order dated 20.04.2015. Under the garb of the review petition, the petitioners seek an opportunity to argue the entire case afresh which would amount to converting the review petition into an appeal and the same is not sustainable in law.
8. As a result and in view of the foregoing, this review application is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(P.Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

inder

1 AIR 1995 SC 455
2 AIR 2000 SC 1650
3 AIR 2000 SC 85
4 2005 (2) SCC 332
5 2005 (6) SCC 651