

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**REVP No. 121 of 2016**

- Sharad Kohle S/o Late Shri Sunder Lal Kohle, Aged About 19 Years R/o- Ekta Nagar, Bhilai-3, PS Bhilai – 3, Civil & Revenue District- Durg, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board Through Its Secretary, C.S.E.B., Raipur, Tahsil And District- Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Joint Secretary, (Karmik)-2, Chhattisgarh State, Electricity Board, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Superintendent Engineer, (Su/sa) Division -2, CSEB, Durg, District- Durg, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Anil Sonkar, S/o Late Shri Mohan Lal Sonkar, Aged About 40 Years R/o- Purani Basti, Sonkar Para, P.S. Kotwali Raipur, Tahsil And District- Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondent**Application for review of the order dated 4-4-2016 passed in****MCC No.237 of 2016****By circulation in chamber****SB : Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****20/12/2016****I.A. No.01**

1. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing the review petition.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application (IA No.01), the same is allowed and the delay of 75 days in filing the review petition is condoned.
3. The matter is taken up for consideration in the chamber under provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 90 under Chapter VI of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2007.

4. The review petitioner (for short 'applicant') seeks review of the order dated 04.04.2016 passed by this Court in MCC No.237/2016 on the ground that while hearing the MCC, the counsel could not explain the delay in filing the MCC properly. The applicant contended that his father died on 23.09.1998 and thereafter the applicant was involved to perform marriage of his sisters, education of his brothers and maintenance of the family etc., therefore, he could not properly prosecute the matter.
5. In the garb of Review Application, the applicant was seeking to urge the merits of the decision all over again which is impermissible under the review jurisdiction. The order of which review is sought is a detailed and reasoned order. There is no error apparent on the face of the record to warrant invocation of review jurisdiction.
6. The scope of the review jurisdiction is narrow confined to errors apparent on the face of the record or if a relevant provision of law had been overlooked. In other words, it is only a patent error which is amenable to review and not an error which may have to be discovered by a process of reasoning and what may be called a virtual rehearing of the matter. In the garb of a Review Petition, this Court cannot sit in judgment over its own order.
7. In view of the above, the review petition, *sans* merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Ashu