

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**REVP No. 33 of 2017**

1. Shakila Beghum W/o Mohd. Nisar, Aged About 48 Years R/o Devendra Nagar, Near Railway Crossing, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Mohd. Nawab S/o Shaukat Ali, Aged About 48 Years R/o Devendra Nagar, Near Railway Crossing, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Mohd. Jawed S/o Hafijudin Mohammad, Aged About 42 Years R/o Devendra Nagar, Near Railway Crossing, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Mohd. Nizam S/o Mohd. Nisar, Aged About 31 Years R/o Devendra Nagar, Near Railway Crossing, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Municipal Corporation Raipur Through Municipal Commissioner Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Zone Commissioner, Zone No.2 Municipal Corporation Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Chhattisgarh Sadak Vikas Nigam Through The Managing Director 3rd Floor, Sirpur Bhawan Premises Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Sushil Dubey, Advocate
For Respondents-State	:	Shri PK Bhaduri, GA for the State
For Respondent-Municipal Corporation	:	Shri Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****02/03/2017**

1. The applicants (writ petitioners) preferred the present petition for review of the order dated 27.01.2017, passed in WPC No.201/2017 on the ground that the authorities are rehabilitating the petitioners under the BSUP

Scheme but no alternative arrangements have been made to run their small shops for earning their livelihood and the authorities without issuing any notice to the petitioners, they are threatening them to demolish their house.

2. In the garb of Review Application, the applicants were 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.
3. 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.
4. In view of the above, the review petition, sans merit is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Ashu