

Shephali

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION NO. 2 OF 2015
IN
COMPANY APPLICATION NO. 159 OF 2015
IN
COMPANY PETITION NO. 519 OF 2013

Irshad Hussain Khatib & 2 Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

Riyaz Ahmed Lambay & Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Amit Lulla, for the Petitioners.

Mrs. A. R. Lambay, i/b Vikas Singh, for the Respondents.

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J

DATED: 20th July 2015

PC:-

1. Heard. The Petition seeks a review of an order dated 13th February 2014. That was an order in the winding up petition. The Company Petition was admitted, made returnable and directed to be advertised. At that time, a Company Application being Company Application (L) No. 632 of 2013, was also disposed of with a statement that it did not survive. The present Review Petition is

directed against that order by the Applicants in that Company Application.

2. I have heard learned counsel and I have also perused with their assistance the Review Petition. The original Company Application is annexed as Exhibit "B" at page 28 to the Review Petition. It indicates that there was some dispute between the directors of the Respondent-Company. The Applicants claimed to be the directors of that Company and on that basis, sought intervention in this winding up petition, which was brought by a Creditor for non-payment of his debts. It is to be noted that the Company was fully represented at the hearing of the Company Petition for admission and contested the Petitioner's claim.

3. It is well settled that grounds for review are limited. The power of review is statutory and limited. It is not to be used to continually revisit past orders. No ground for review is made out. Even otherwise, there is no ground made out for entertaining the Review Petition. The Review Petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)