

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED : 19.09.2017**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE V.M.VELUMANI**

**Review Application Nos.177 & 178 of 2011**  
**in C.R.P. Nos.291 & 331 of 2011**

Thangavel

..Petitioner in  
Rev.Appl.No.177/2011

Rajadurai

..Petitioner in  
Rev.Appl.No.178/2011

**Vs.**

1. The General Manager,  
Bombay Burma Trading Corporation  
By its power of Attorney Divakaran,  
Mudis Bazaar Post, Valparai Taluk,  
Coimbatore District.

..1<sup>st</sup> Respondent in both  
the Review Applications

2.Pavitharan

..2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent in  
Rev.Appl.No.177/2011

2.G.N.Rich

..2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent in  
Rev.Appl.No.178/2011

**COMMON PRAYER:** Review Applications filed under Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 114 of C.P.C, to review the orders dated 18.07.2011 made in C.R.P.Nos.291 and 331 of 2011 on the file of this Court.

(in both the Review Applications)

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Manokaran

For R1 : Mr.V.Achuthan

For R2 : Not ready in notice

**ORDER**

The petitioner in both the Review Applications have come out with the present Review Applications to review the orders dated 18.07.2011 made in C.R.P.Nos.291 and 331 of 2011 on the file of this Court.

2. The review petitioners are the petitioners in the C.R.P.Nos.291 and 331 of 2011. They filed the above said Civil Revision Petitions, challenging the orders dated 08.11.2010, made in I.A.Nos.1190 and 1191 of 2010 in A.S.Nos.27 and 28 of 2009, on the file of the First Additional District Court, Coimbatore. The I.A.Nos.1190 and 1191 of 2010 challenged in the Civil Revision Petitions were filed to condone the delay in filing the petition to restore the A.S.Nos.27 and 28 of 2009, which were dismissed for default on 13.07.2009. This Court, considering the reasons given by the petitioner to condone the delay, dismissed the Civil Revision Petitions, holding that the review applicants have not given sufficient reason for condoning the delay and petitioners have not filed any application to set aside the exparte decree passed in the First Appeals filed by the respondents for enhancement of damages.


3. The learned counsel appearing for the review applicants has argued the matter on merits and could not point out any error in the

order. It is well settled that the Review Application can be allowed only to rectify the error apparent on the face of the record. In the present case, there is no error warranting interference to reconsider the said orders.

4. In the result, both the Review Applications are dismissed. No costs.

Index : Yes/No  
gsa

19.09.2017



WEB COPY

**V.M.VELUMANI,J.**

gsa



**Review Application Nos.177 & 178 of 2011**  
**in C.R.P. Nos.291 & 331 of 2011**

WEB COPY

**19.09.2017**