

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

**C.A.O.No.1496/2018 AND M.C.A.ST. No.15855/2018 IN W.P.NO.651/2014 (D)**  
 (PRITESH S/O RAJU THUL VERSUS UNION OF INDIA AND ANOTHER)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
 appearances, Court's orders of directions  
 and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mrs. Gauri Venkatraman, Advocate with Ms. Monika Ukhale, Advocate for the applicant.

Ms N. Dubey, Advocate for the non-applicant no.1.

**CORAM: P. N. DESHMUKH AND A.S. CHANDURKAR, JJ**  
**DATE : 07<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2018.**

Heard learned Counsel for the applicant as well as the learned Counsel for the non-applicants.

There is a delay of about 1348 days in seeking review. We have perused the review application and heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

Though it is urged by the learned Counsel for the applicant that the provisions of Rule 29-B(b) of the Mining Rules, 1955 have not been rightly applied to the case in hand, it is found that the impugned judgment does not indicate any error apparent on the face of record. It has been held that said Rule does not assist the case of the applicant. A fresh hearing by seeking review of the judgment so as to take another view of the matter would not be permissible. Hence, the application for condonation of delay as well as the review application stand rejected.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**