

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**REVP No. 68 of 2019**

1. Ramdular Sahu S/o Shri Tulsiram Sahu Aged About 38 Years R/o Village Teka (Hardi) Gram Panchayat Kahardabri, Tahsil Dongargaon, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Panchayat And Social Welfare D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Kanhardabri Tahsil Dongergaon, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
3. Duleshwar Singh Rajput S/o Shri Kamlesh Singh Rajput Aged About 35 Years R/o Village Teka (Hardi) Gram Panchayat Kanhardabri, Tahsil Dongargaon, District- Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
4. The Director Panchayat Chhattisgarh, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Avit Lakra, Advocate
For State/Respondents	:	Mr. Saleem Kazi, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****22/04/2019**

1. The present Review Petition has been filed seeking review of Order dated 14.01.2019 passed by this Court in WPS No. 4018 of 2007. By way of the said order, this Court has dismissed the writ petition. The petitioner applicant has now filed a Review Petition seeking review of the Order dated 14.01.2019. However, a perusal of the record reveals that the ground which the petitioner has prayed in the Review Petition are not one which could be entertained by this Court in exercise of its power of judicial review. If at all, the petitioner is aggrieved of the decision rendered by this Court and the grounds which intend to take in the Review Petition are all which could be raised only by challenging the

same before the Appellate Forum available to the petitioner. These grounds would not be available to the petitioner or for that matter to this Court, in exercise of its review jurisdiction.

2. So far as the Review Petition is concerned, it is settled position of law that review can be entertained only in the event of an error apparent on the face of record that is to say the error which is so glaring or which could lead to miscarriage of justice. Grounds which were already raised and have not been considered or ground which were now raised earlier and which the applicant now intends to raise by way of review or materials which were not considered by this Court while deciding the Writ Petition are not which could be taken note of while hearing of a Review Petition.
3. For the said reason, the Review Petition is not sustainable, reserving the right of the petitioner to challenge the Order in an appellate jurisdiction if he so wants, the Review Petition thus stands rejected.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge**