

disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected, but lies only for patent error. Error contemplated under the rule must be such which is apparent on the face of the record and not an error which has to be fished out and searched. It must be an error of inadvertence. The power of review can be exercised for correction of a mistake but not to substitute a view. The mere possibility of two views on the subject is not a ground for review. Review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order XLVII, Rule 1 of C.P.C. ”

5. In view thereof and after perusing the grounds set out in paragraphs 8(a) to (d), I do not find that any case is made out for reviewing the order dated 27.07.2015. If at all, the petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated 27.07.2015, they have appropriate remedy of challenging the said order before higher forum. Hence, Petition fails and the same is dismissed.

(R. G. KETKAR, J.)

Minal Parab