

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

REVP No. 62 of 2017

1. Jankram Bhargav S/o Shri Malikram Bhargav, Aged About 55 Years
R/o Incharge Manager Of Seva Sarkari Maryadit, Tikari Tahsil Masturi
District Bilaspur, Village And Post Tikari District Bilaspur,
Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Collector, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh State Schedule Tribe Commission, Through Secretary,
61 Jalvihar Colony Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Joint Registrar, Sahkari Sanstha Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
4. Malikram Daharia, Seller Seva Sahkari Samiti Maryadit Tikari, Tahsil
Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

Application for review of the order dated 03.05.2017 passed in

WPS No.611 of 2007

By circulation in chamber

SB : Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

03/08/2017

1. The matter is taken up for consideration in the chamber under provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 90 under Chapter VI of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2007.
2. The review petitioner (for short 'applicant') seeks review of the order dated 03.05.2017 passed by this Court in WPS No.611 of 2007 on the ground that the petitioner is the In-charge Manager of Sewa Sahakari Samiti Maryadit and he has been authorized by the Board of Directors to file the writ petition. According to the applicant, he is the complainant and on the basis of his complaint, the enquiry was conducted and the order of termination was passed.

3. On going through the order dated 03.05.2017 passed in WPS No.611/2007, which is sought to be reviewed, it appears that this Court has observed that the applicant is not personally aggrieved in service dispute between the employee and respondent No.4 Society. Albeit the applicant has raised a ground that he has been authorized by the Board of Directors to file writ petition but on verification of the entire record no authorization letter was found.
4. In the garb of Review Application, the applicant was seeking to urge the merits of the decision all over again which is impermissible under the review jurisdiction. The order of which review is sought is a detailed and reasoned order. There is no error apparent on the face of the record to warrant invocation of review jurisdiction.
5. The scope of the review jurisdiction is narrow confined to errors apparent on the face of the record or if a relevant provision of law had been overlooked. In other words, it is only a patent error which is amenable to review and not an error which may have to be discovered by a process of reasoning and what may be called a virtual rehearing of the matter. In the garb of a Review Petition, this Court cannot sit in judgment over its own order. Be that as it may, the applicant cannot be allowed to commit a volte-face and take up new pleas in the review petition.
6. In view of the above, the review petition, *sans* merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)