

RA-RS-56-2019 (O&M) in
RSA-5492-2016

1

103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

RA-RS-56-2019 (O&M) in
RSA-5492-2016
Date of decision : 12.07.2019

Umed Singh

... Appellant

Versus

Parmeshwari (deceased) through LRs and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Hardip Dahiya, Advocate and
Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate
for the review applicant/appellant.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

The review application tantamounts to re-agitating of the grounds of appeal, which is not permissible in view of the *ratio decidendi* culled out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in “**Tamilnadu Terminated Full Time Temporary LIC Employees Association Vs. S.K. Roy, The Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India and another**” 2016 (9) **SCC 366**. The relevant paragraph of the judgment reads as under:-

"Review is not re-hearing of an original matter. The power of review cannot be confused with appellate power which enables a superior court to correct all errors committed by a subordinate court. A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to re-open concluded adjudications. This Court, in Jain Studios Ltd. v. Shin Satellite Public Co. Ltd. (2006) 5 SCC 501, held as under:

**RA-RS-56-2019 (O&M) in
RSA-5492-2016**

2

11. So far as the grievance of the applicant on merits is concerned, the Learned Counsel for the opponent is right in submitting that virtually the applicant seeks the same relief which had been sought at the time of arguing the main matter and had been negated. Once such a prayer had been refused, no review petition would lie which would convert rehearing of the original matter. It is settled law that the power of review cannot be confused with appellate power which enables a superior court to correct all errors committed by a subordinate court. It is not rehearing of an original matter. A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications. The power of review can be exercised with extreme care, caution and circumspection and only in exceptional cases."

In view of the aforementioned observation, I do not find any error apparent on the face of record, much less, no ground is made out for interference and accordingly, the present review application stands dismissed.

There is an application for delay of 138 days in filing the review application. The ground and explanation given in the application is not reasonable, much less, cogent and accordingly, the application is also dismissed.

12.07.2019
Yogesh Sharma

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

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