

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Review Petition No. 27 of 2018**

Brij Bihari Gupta S/o A.P. Gupta, aged about 29 years, R/o Village Darripara, Tahsil & District - Surajpur (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Jeerman Bai, Wd/o Late Kishun Ram, aged about 52 years, Caste - Koir
2. Smt. Urmila Bai W/o Shyam Lal, D/o Late Kishun Ram, Caste – Koir, aged about 22 years.
3. Ku. Meena D/o Late Kishun Ram, aged about 19 years, All are R/o Village Jhamanpara (Darripara) Post Darripara, P.S. Jhilmili, Tahsil & District – Surajpur (CG)
4. Vinod Kumar Agarwal S/o Teckchand Agrawal, aged about 40 years, R/o Bhaiyathan Road, Surajpur, District – Surajpur (CG)
5. The United India Insurance Co. Ltd., Branch Office Near Ram Mandir, Ambikapur, District – Surguja (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Atanu Ghosh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****11/04/2018**

1. The review petition has been filed seeking review of order dated 03.01.2018 passed by this court in Misc. Appeal (C) Nos. 54 of 2011.
2. The contention of the petitioner is that the judgment passed by this court against which review is being sought for is in contravention to the recent decision of the Supreme Court in case of Naveen Kumar Vs. Vijay Kumar and Ors. in Civil Appeal No. 1427 of 2018, decided on 06.02.2018. It was further contended that the petitioner in the present

case is possessive owner and he cannot be equated with that of registered owner for the purpose of fastening the liability under the provisions of Motor Vehicles Act. Moreover, the ground raised by the petitioner also is that sale had not been completed under the provisions of sale of Goods Act.

3. In the opinion of this court, the three grounds raised by the petitioner in the review petition cannot be the grounds on which the review petition could be entertained. The acceptance of the grounds would literally amount to re-hearing of appeal on merits which otherwise is not permissible under the review jurisdiction where the powers of review is confined to the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. Review jurisdiction is not an Appeal in disguise. It does not permit re-hearing of matter on merits.
4. Re-appreciation of the facts of the case and passing of fresh order by way of a review petition is by now a well settled proposition of law. A review would only lie in case if there is an error apparent on the face of records and the error should also be glaringly visible. No such grounds have been put forth by the review petitioner in the present review petition and the judgment of Supreme Court also is subsequent to the order passed by this court on 03.01.2018.
5. Accordingly, the review petition deserve to be is dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE