

102

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**RA-RS-86-C-2017 in
RSA-6024-2015
Decided on: 15.01.2018**

Sunita and another**.....Appellants****versus****Ramesh Devi and another****.....Respondents****Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT****Present:** Mr.Naresh Kumar, Advocate
for the applicants/respondents.

Rajbir Sehrawat, J.(Oral)

1. The present review application has been filed by the respondents in the main appeal. Although, the substantive prayer of review in this application is missing from the prayer clause of this application, however, the headnote of this application shows that the present application has been filed seeking a review of judgment/order dated 28.08.2017; whereby the present appeal was finally disposed of but with some observations made in the last para of the judgment on the basis of agreement and on the insistence of the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The perusal of the application further shows; and it is also argued by the learned counsel for the applicant, that the respondents/applicants are not aggrieved of the main judgment relating to the decision of the appeal, however, the present application has been filed restricting the review to the last paragraph of the judgment; containing the above said observations made on the basis of the statements of both the learned counsel.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the applicants, this Court does not find

any ground of review. The bare perusal of the last para of the judgment shows that it has been included in the judgment only because the counsel for the parties had jointly stated before the Court to the same effect, as is recorded in the order. Still further, the order itself says that these observations were being made only because the parties were insisting for inclusion of these observations in the order.

4. Even in the present application, there is no averment that the statement made by the counsel for the applicant, as contained in the order, was not authorized one or that the counsel was not asked to make such statement. So, even now, there is no denial regarding the statement made by the counsel on the basis of which all these observations were included in the last para of the judgment.

5. It appears that the respondents have filed this application to get the order changed by the change of counsel. Otherwise, the only averment in the application is that the Court had no jurisdiction to make the observations contained in the last para of the judgment. This argument is not a ground for review. In review, the Court cannot re-hear the case or re-appreciate the arguments. This is the sole domain of the next Appellate Court, if any appeal is preferred against the order under review.

6. No other ground for review has been even averred in the application. There is no error in the order, on the face of it. Further, there is no other sufficient ground to review the order.

7. Hence, finding no merits in the present application, the same is dismissed.

15th January, 2018

shabha

**[RAJBIR SEHRAWAT]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	-	Yes
Whether reportable	-	No