

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

R.A. No.177-CII of 2014 in
C.R. No.3935 of 1999

DATE OF DECISION : 4.11.2016

Sat Narain and others

APPLICANTS

VERSUS

Anil Kumar

RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER

Present:- Shri S.K.Garg Narwana, Senior Advocate with Shri Rahul Deswal,
Advocate for the applicant.

Shri Rajesh Sethi with Shri Tushar Garg and Shri Prince Ravesh,
Advocates for the non-applicant.

MAHESH GROVER, J.

This application has been filed for review of the order dated 24.4.2014 primarily on the ground that the identity of the property is seriously in question. This Court in its order under review dated 24.4.2014, had noticed the candid admission of the review-petitioner about the decree obtained in a civil suit on a prior occasion as being qua the property in dispute. If that be so, then there is hardly any reason to look into any other material to dispute the identity of the property which is well known to the review-petitioner who is the tenant therein.

That apart, the review application has not been filed by the counsel who had prosecuted the revision petition and in view of the consistent law in this regard,

such petitions need to be discouraged. In **T.N.Electricity Board and another v. N.Raju Reddiar and another** 1997 A.I.R. (SC) 1005), the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under :-

“2. Once the petition for review is dismissed, no application for clarification should be filed, much less with the change of the advocate-on-record. This practice of changing the advocates and filing repeated petitions should be deprecated with heavy hand for purity of administration of law and salutary and healthy practice.”

The said view was followed by this Court in its decisions rendered in **Shanti Devi v. Ran Singh** 1998(2) R.C.R. (Civil) 505, **Mukhtiar Singh v. Union of India and others** 2009 SCC OnLine P&H 11180, **Mukhtiar Singh v. State of Punjab** 2014 SCC OnLine P&H 12775 and **Virender Kumar Karwa v. Union of India** 2015 SCC OnLine P&H 19103. It was also followed by the Allahabad High Court in **Ishwar Dayal and others v. State of U.P. and others** 2015(152) AIC 913.

There is thus, no justifiable ground to recall/review the order dated 24.4.2014.

Dismissed.

November 4, 2016
GD

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No