

247-A

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RA-RF No.342-CI of 2016 in
RFA No.3071 of 2012
Date of decision: 12.08.2016

Sunheri Devi and others

... Applicants-appellants

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. B.K. Bagri, Advocate for the applicants-appellants.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Applicants seek review of the judgment dated 11.05.2016.

It is the settled proposition of law that each case is to be decided on its own peculiar fact situation obtaining on record. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the applicants could not point out any material available on record, which may justify the claim of the applicants put forth by them in the instant review application claiming the severance charges to the extent of 50% of the market value than 30% thereof, which has been granted to them vide order dated 11.05.2016 which is being sought to be reviewed. In fact, learned counsel for the applicants wants to re-argue the appeal under the garb of present review application which is not permissible in law. Further no mistake of any kind in the judgment dated 11.05.2016, which might be said to be a mistake apparent on the record, has been pointed out.

After hearing the learned counsel for the applicants, no case for interference has been made out.

Review application is wholly misconceived and the same is dismissed, as such.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

12.08.2016
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No