

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.

C.A.O. No.1868/2016
in
MCA St. No. 7935/2016 (for Review)
in
Writ Petition No.5923/2013 (D)
(The Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Amravati and another .vs.
Rahul Motising Brahman and others)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders or directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. M.G. Rathi, Advocate for Applicants
Mr. S.M. Ukey, Additional Government Pleader for Non-
applicants Nos. 56 and 57.

CORAM : B.R. Gavai & S.B. Shukre, JJ.
DATED : December 20, 2016.

For the grounds stated in the application,
the application is allowed. The delay is condoned.

M.C.A. St. No.7935/2016.

1. The applicants have approached this Court seeking review of the judgment and order dated 18.06.2014 passed by this Court.
2. Mr. Rathi, learned counsel for the applicants submits that another Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No. 2440/2014 along with the companion matters has taken a different view and, therefore, it is a good case for reviewing the order passed by this Court.
3. The order under review was challenged by the present applicants before Their Lordships of the Apex Court. Their Lordships of the Apex Court had

disposed of the special leave petitions on 01.02.2016 by observing thus:-

"Delay condoned.
The special leave petitions are dismissed.
Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of."

4. It could thus be seen that the order under review was challenged before the Hon'ble Apex Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court had dismissed the special leave petitions. As such the judgment and order under review has reached finality.

5. It could further be seen that before the Apex Court, even the liberty was not sought to seek review of the judgment and order under review.

6. In that view of the matter, we do not find that case is made out for invoking the review jurisdiction. Application is rejected.

7. At this stage , learned counsel for the applicants seeks stay of the order passed by this Court for a period of four weeks.

8. We do not understand as to what purpose would be served by staying the order dismissing the review application. The prayer is rejected.

JUDGE

JUDGE