

\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 9109/2016**

ISH RANI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shaad Anwar, Advocate.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Vikram Jetley, CGSC for
respondent No.1.

Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate for
respondent Nos.2 to 6.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% **08.01.2018**

Review Petition No.12/2018 and C.M. No.496/2018 (for condonation of delay of 210 days)

1. After arguments, the review petition is disposed of as not pressed as it is noted that not only the judgment dated 27.3.2017 is based on ratios of various judgments of the Supreme Court but petitioner had challenged the judgment of this Court in an SLP which was dismissed observing that there are no grounds to interfere. A review petition filed in the Supreme Court against dismissal of the SLP was also dismissed. In

W.P.(C) No.9109/2016

page 1 of 2

the case of ***Gangadhara Palo Vs. The Revenue Divisional Officer and Anr.*** (2011) 4 SCC 602 Supreme Court has held that the doctrine of merger will apply even if the SLP is dismissed in limine, and even if one line of reasoning is given. In this case there is reasoning given that there are no grounds which are found by the Supreme Court to interfere with the judgment of this Court dated 27.3.2017.

2. Although I was inclined to impose very heavy costs for dismissal of this review petition which is clearly an abuse of process of law as also wastage of judicial time, however, at the request of the counsel for the petitioner, the review petition is simply disposed of as not pressed.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

JANUARY 08, 2018

Ne

W.P.(C) No.9109/2016

page 2 of 2