

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****REVP No. 41 of 2017**

- Divisional Manager, The Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. Opposite Site of High Court Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

**Versus**

1. Smt. Rekha Uike W/o Late Sukendra Singh, Aged About 20 Years Caste Gond, R/o Village Umjhariya, Post Beed, Thana Jaithari, District Anuppur M.P.
2. Ku. Nisha Uike D/o Late Sukendra Singh, Age 11 Months, Minor Through Guardian Mother Smt. Rekha Uike, Caste Gond, R/o Village Umjhariya, Post Beed, Thana Jaithari, District Anuppur M.P.
3. Sumit Uike S/o Late Sukendra Sigh Uike, Age 03 Months, Minor Through Guardian Mother Smt. Rekha Uike, Caste Gond, R/o Village Umjhariya, Post Beed, Thana Jaithari, District Anuppur M.P.
4. Lalji Singh Uike S/o Jailal Singh Uike, Aged About 49 Years Caste Gond, R/o Village Umjhariya, Post Beed, Thana Jaithari, District Anuppur M.P.
5. Adharia Bai W/o Lalji Singh Uike, Aged About 44 Years Caste Gond, R/o Village Umjhariya, Post Beed, Thana Jaithari, District Anuppur M.P.
6. Amol Singh S/o Ramprasad Gond, Aged About 30 Years R/o Nimdha, Thana Marwahi, Tah. Marwahi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
7. Anand Jayaswal S/o Heera Lal Jaiswal, Aged About 42 Years Caste Kalar, R/o Village Nimdha, P.O. Nimdha, Thana Marwahi, Tah. Marwahi, Distt. Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

Application for review of the order dated 10-02-2017 passed inM.A.C.No. 354 of 2007**By circulation in Chamber**

**S.B.: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ram Prasanna Sharma**

**19-08-2019**

1. The matter is taken up for consideration in the chamber under provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 90 under Chapter VI of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2007.
2. By this review petition, the review petitioner seeks review of the order dated 10-02-2017 passed by this Court in MAC No. 354 of 2007 on the ground mentioned in the petition.
3. After going through the record of the MAC No. 354 of 2007 it is manifest that after appreciating all the facts and legal aspect of the matter, this Court has disposed of the appeal on merit.
4. Considering all the grounds mentioned in the review petition which are in the nature of taking liberty to re-argue the case, there is no other ground showing any manifest error on the record and there is nothing that any new facts which could have been produced earlier but could not be produced despite diligent efforts made by the applicants
5. It is well settled principles of law that the review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. By this review petition, liberty to re-argue the entire case on merit afresh is not permissible because it would amount to convert the review petition into an appeal (See: Meera

Bhanjan v. Smt. Nirmal Kumar Chowdhary, AIR 1995 SC 455, Lily Thomas etc. v. Union of India and others, AIR 2000 SC 1650, Ajit Kumar Rath v. State of Orissa and others, AIR 2000 SC 85, Government of T.N. & Others v. M. Ananchu Asari and others, (2005) 2 SCC 332, and Kerala State Electricity Board v. Hitech Electrothermics & Hydropower Ltd. and others, (2005) 6 SCC 651.

6. As a sequel, the review petition, *sans substratum* is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-  
(Ram Prasanna Sharma)  
Judge

Raju