

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO. 76 OF 2015
IN
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3125 OF 2013
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 6322 OF 1998

Smt. Vimal Vasantao Songaonkar
deceased through her heirs & L.Rs
Smt. S. S. Songaonkar & Ors. .. Petitioners
vs.
Ganesh Dadu Gaikwad .. Respondent

Mr. S. P. Thorat for Petitioners.
Mr. Balasaheb Deshmukh for Respondent.

CORAM : M. S. SONAK, J.
DATE : 27 AUGUST 2015

P.C. :-

1] There is no case made out for review. The review petitioners have been unable to point out error apparent on face of record. No doubt, the contention is that severe hardship will occasion to the review petitioners. Although the same is not really a ground for review, it needs to be noted that the suit premises are situate in Pune City and in respect of the same, the landlord had claimed compensation at the rate of Rs.25,000/- per month. What has been awarded is Rs.1,500/- per month.

2] That apart, the learned counsel for the landlord, on basis of instructions from the landlord, alleges that review petitioners have

an alternate flat which has been let out by her, and further, the review petitioners son has a motorbike which itself is valued at Rs.1.5 lacs. It is not possible to accept these allegations at this stage, in absence of any material being placed on record. However, even if such allegations are ignored, there is no case made out for review of the order. Accordingly, review petition is dismissed.

3] Time limit for deposit of arrears in terms of order dated 10 June 2015 is extended by a period of eight weeks from today.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)

Chandka