

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4950 OF 2015
AND
REVIEW APPLICATION (ST) NO.9921 OF 2015

KISAN SHRIPAT PATIL AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
RAGHO VEDU PATIL

...
Advocate for Applicants : Shri Bhavar Nitin R.

...
CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.
Dated: January 22, 2016

...
PER COURT :-

1. The applicants have filed the Civil Application for seeking condonation of 30 days delay in filing the Review Petition, with regard to the order passed by this Court, dated 26.2.2015, in Writ Petition No.1487 of 2015.
2. Grievance of the applicants is that the order under review was passed in light of Exhibits "X" and "Y", which are two documents cited by the respondent. The learned Advocate for the applicants, as well as his colleague advocate, both were absent on 20.2.2015. The matter was, therefore, posted on 22.2.2015. Even on that date, none appeared for the petitioners. The matter was, therefore, posted to 26.2.2015. Again on the said date, both the learned Advocates for the petitioners were absent.
3. Learned Advocate for the respondent pointed out to this Court that the petitioner had challenged the order dated 2.12.2014 in R.D. No.159 of 2012, which was an interlocutory order. Thereafter, the said Darkhast proceedings were disposed off on 4.2.2015. Consequentially, the petition had become infructuous, since the Regular Darkhast itself was disposed off.
4. I have heard Shri Bhavar, learned Advocate for the applicant on the review petition itself. He has virtually argued the Writ Petition as if this Court is hearing an appeal. He has been unable to point out what is the error apparent on the face of the order.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

2
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4950 OF 2015
AND
REVIEW APPLICATION (ST) NO.9921 OF 2015

5. In the light of the above, the Civil Application for condonation of delay is allowed. However, since there is no merit in the Review Application, the same is dismissed.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

...