

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

REV.P. No. 76 of 2013

1. Amitabh Jaiswal S/o Late Kanni Lal Jaiswal, R/o Police Line Ramanujanj Road, Ambikapur, Distt. Surguja C.G.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Kameshwar Jaiswal S/o Gopal Prasad Jaiswal, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Karanji, Thana- Jaynagar, Tah. Surajpur, Distt. Surajpur (C.G.)
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: Collector, Ambikapur C.G.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner. -	Mr. Amitabh Jaiswal, petitioner in person.
For Respondent No.1 -	None.
For Respondent No.2 -	Ms. Pushpa Dwivedi, Panel Lawyer for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice T. P. Sharma
Hon'ble Shri Justice Inder Singh Uboweja

Order On Board
(07/05/2015)

T.P. Sharma, J

1. This is petition for review of judgment dated 11.03.2013 passed by the learned Single Judge in Second Appeal No.188/2012.
2. We have heard petitioner in person and learned Panel Lawyer for the State/respondent No.2.
3. Petitioner in person submits that while dismissing the second appeal, Court has not considered the substantial question of law proposed by the petitioner in person, even Court itself has not examined the matter. Substantial question of law involved in second appeal has not been considered while dismissing the appeal. He further submits that respondent No.1 is Kameshwari Jaiswal and not Kameshwar Jaiswal. Likewise, Civil Judge Class-II, Sitapur, has not decided the case *interalia*, Civil Judge Class-II, Link

Court, Sitapur, has decided the case, which has been wrongly mentioned in the judgment. He also submits that perverse finding of facts by itself is substantial question of law.

4. We have perused the judgment in question, memo of review petition along with second appeal No.188/2012 and other documents.
5. After considering all aspects of second appeal, learned Single Judge came into conclusion that there is no substantial question of law.
6. We do not find any illegality in such finding. In case of any arithmetical or typographical error, the petitioner is at liberty to file petition for correction of such typographical or arithmetical error.
7. With these observations, review petition is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed at the admission stage itself. No order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE