

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

THURSDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/7TH PHALGUNA, 1936

RP.No. 380 of 2014 () IN RSA.901/2010

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN RSA NO.901/2010 of HIGH COURT OF
KERALA DATED 3/2/2014.

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/APPELLANT:

ARUNDATHI,
W/O. SEKHARAN, VENMANAKKAL HOUSE,
VELLATUMPADOM ROAD,
THRIKKAKARA, ERNAKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.K.G.BALASUBRAMANIAN

RESPONDENT (S) /RESPONDENTS:

1. SASANKAN,
S/O. SUKUMARAN, PUTHEN VEEDU,
NEAR MUKKALUVATTOM TEMPLE, VAKKOM VILLAGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT - 695 308.

2. RADHAMANI,
D/O. ARUNDATHI, VENMANAKKAL HOUSE,
VELLATUMPADOM ROAD,
THRIKKAKARA, ERNAKULAM - 682 201.

3. SOBHANA,
D/O. ARUNDATHI, PULIYANA HOUSE,
NEAR KESHAVANMASH HOUSE, N.A.D ROAD, NEAR L B S,
KALAMASSERY P.O., ALUVA, ERNAKULAM - 683 104.

R1 BY ADV. SRI.VAKKOM N.VIJAYAN

R1 BY ADV. SRI.M.BALAGOVINDAN

R1 BY ADV. SMT.V.RENJU

R1 BY ADV. SRI.P.ANIYAN

R2 BY ADV. SMT.T.SUDHAMAI

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 26-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

K. HARILAL, J.

**R.P. No.380 of 2014 in
R.S.A.No. 901 of 2010**

Dated this the 26th day of February, 2015

ORDER

This Review Petition is filed to review the findings in the judgment dated 3/2/2014 passed in the above Regular Second Appeal. The review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 41 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. The Review Petition has to be entertained only on the ground of error apparent on the face of the record and not on any other ground. An error apparent on the face of the record must be such an error which must strike one on mere looking at the record and would not require any long drawn process of reasoning on points where there may

conceivably be two opinions. In short, the review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is rebuilt and corrected, but lies only for a correction of an apparent error.

2. In the above point of view, I have gone through the grounds raised in this Review Petition. I am of the opinion that none of these grounds are sufficient to invoke the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 of the C.P.C. This is an appeal in disguise only.

In this analysis, I dismiss this Review Petition.

Sd/-

(K. HARILAL, JUDGE)

Nan/

//true copy//

P.S. to Judge