

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

RA-RS-81-C-2018 (O&M) in
RSA No.421 of 2016

Date of decision: 13.09.2018

Parveen Kumar and others

..... Appellants

Versus

Sarjeet and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. Jai Vir Yadav, Advocate
for the applicant-respondent No.1.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

This review application has been filed by learned counsel for the applicant-respondent No.1 pointing out that his presence has not been marked although, he was present and argued the appeal.

Learned counsel has further pointed out that two appeals were simultaneously heard although decided by the separate judgment and therefore, there is a confusion in marking the presence of the counsel. Since, learned counsel for the applicant-respondent No.1 has made a statement at bar, therefore, there is no reason to disbelieve that assertion. Hence, the attendance of learned counsel for respondent No.1 would be marked and corrected judgment would be uploaded.

Learned counsel for the review-applicant has tried to argue the the review-application as an appeal. The jurisdiction of the Court is very limited while exercising the review jurisdiction. The Court cannot re-hear

the appeal.

Hence, the review application is dismissed. However, the presence of the counsel be noted in the judgment dated 30.01.2018.

No order is required to be passed in miscellaneous application (CM-12688-C-2018) for condoning the delay.

13.09.2018
Dinesh Bansal

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No