



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.03.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN

WEB COPY

Rev.Applc. (MD) .No.246 of 2017

in

C.M.P. (MD) No.978 of 2016

in

S.A. (MD) No.SR4337 of 2016

1.Subbulakshmi

2.Ganthanayagavalli

.. Review Petitioner

vs.

1.The Tahsildar,
Aruppukottai Taluk,
Virudhunagar District.

2.The District Collector,
Virudhunagar District,
Virudhunagar.

3.Sangaralingam

4.Kumarasamy

5.Gopal

6.Settipatti Panchayat,
Represented by its President,
Chettipatti Village,
Aruppukottai Taluk,
Virudhunagar District.

7.Jeyamani

8.Pushpavalli

.. Respondents

Prayer: Review Application filed under Order 47 Rules 1 and 2 C.P.C. read with Section 114 C.P.C. against the order dated 23.03.2016 made in C.M.P. (MD) No.978 of 2016 in S.A. (MD) No.SR4337 of 2016.

Prayer in CMP(MD) .978 of 2016:

Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under order 41 Rule 3(A) r/w order 42 Rule 1 CPC, praying that, to condone the delay of 2877 days in preferring the above SA(MD)SR No.4337 of 2016 and thus render justice.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.George Stephen Kanikkai Raj

**ORDER**

This Review Application is filed against the order dated 23.03.2016, made in C.M.P. (MD) No. 978 of 2016 in S.A. (MD) No. SR4337 of 2016.

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners and perused the materials available on record.

3. It is to be borne in mind that the scope under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Code is limited under the guise of Review Application. The Review Applicant cannot be allowed to re-argue the matter, which was decided on merits. The Review Application can be entertained only if there is an error apparent on the face of the record warranting interference.

4. In the case on hand, there is no ground to re-agitate the matter for reviewing the order passed by this Court, which considered each and every aspects and also following the dictum laid down by the Honourable Apex Court.

5. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any error apparent on the face of the record warranting interference in the Review Application. Hence, The Review Application is devoid of merits and is liable to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the Review Application is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (P AND A)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

Rev. Applc. (MD) .No.246 of 2017
in
C.M.P. (MD) No.978 of 2016
in
S.A. (MD) No. SR4337 of 2016

SSL

KK/SAR/14.05.2019/ 2P- 1C