

Vinodkumar Laljibhai Thakkar	}	Petitioner
versus		
Mumbai University and Anr.	}	Respondents

**CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
G. S. KULKARNI, JJ.**

P.C. :- (In Chamber)

The petitioner is appearing in person.

2) Since he is appearing in person, we have carefully and sympathetically considered the review petition. In the review petition, the petitioner seeks review of our order passed on 6th April, 2016 in the above writ petition.

3) Though the grounds in the review petition open with a complaint that the judgment suffers from error apparent on the face of the record, what we have noticed is that the petitioner faults this court for having failed to appreciate that he has passed third year L.L.B. examination in the year 1983 and certificate

was also awarded to him in 1984. Further, the Mumbai University never asked the petitioner to submit the certificate of third year L.L.B. examination, in writing or orally. Precisely these are the very grounds to challenge the university's action and as raised in the original petition. Having found that there is no substance, we have rejected the writ petition. We cannot, in the garb of a review, go behind our order and find out whether the same is erroneous for this court has failed to appreciate the factual position correctly and properly, as complained. That would be exercising an appellate power. We do not think it is a permissible exercise in review jurisdiction. There are no grounds to review the order and within the parameters of section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908. The review petition is, therefore, dismissed. The petitioner can always approach the university, if otherwise permissible in law, for appropriate relief.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)