

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION (L) NO. 34 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 688 OF 2016**

The Chief Executive Officer	}	
Mumbai Board - MHADA	}	
and Ors.	}	Petitioners
versus		
Shanta Mallanna Rikkal	}	Respondent

Mr. Prakash G. Lad for the petitioners.

None for the respondent.

**CORAM :- S. C. DHARMADHIKARI &
DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, JJ.**

DATED :- OCTOBER 4, 2016

P.C. :- (In Chamber)

1. Heard Mr. Lad. Perused the order under review. We have also perused the review petition and we find that this is nothing but an attempt to re-argue the matter by highlighting some other facets of the same issue. Merely because these facets, which are projected now, were not highlighted or could not be highlighted effectively is no ground for review of the order. If order under review is erroneous, the remedy of the review petitioners lies elsewhere. Secondly, within the limits and parameters of section 114 read with Order 47 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908, we cannot review this order as if we are presiding over an

appellate court. In the circumstances, we do not think that the review petition can be entertained. It is dismissed.

(DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, J.) (S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)