

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Review Petition No. 38 of 2020**

*{Arising out of order dated 24.10.2019 passed by the Division Bench in Writ Petition
(S) No. 2873 of 2019}*

1. Ku. Priya Kale, d/o Late L.N. Kale, aged about 38 years, posted on A.G.III, at Deputy Director, Prosecution Office Bilaspur, Address C/o Kallu Singh Infront of Bajran Akhada, Tilak Nagar, Bilaspur (C.G.)
2. Alok Ghosh, S/o Late Kamal Krishna Ghosh, aged about 40 years, posted on AG III at DDPO office Surajpur, R/o Bangali Para infront of Rest House Surajpur, District Surajpur (C.G.)

---- Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Home Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Director, Public Prosecution State of Chhattisgarh Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
3. Deputy Director, (Public Prosecution) Sarguja, District Durg (C.G.)
4. Smt. Karuna Toppo Assistant District Public Prosecution Office Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
5. Shri Dhawal Kumar Sinha, Assistant District Public Prosecution Officer Surajpur, District Surajpur (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri N.K. Malaviya, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Shri Vikram Sharma, Deputy Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge****Order on Board****Per P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****04.02.2020**

1. The review Petitioners have moved this Court as being aggrieved by the order dated 24.10.2019 passed by this Court in Writ Petition (S) No. 2873 of 2019 and connected cases.

2. Heard Shri N.K. Malaviya, the learned counsel for the Petitioners in detail. The learned counsel submits that the course of action pursued by the State was correct and sustainable which ought not to have been interfered by this Court as there is intelligible deferentia. However, it is also made to the observation made by this Court in paragraph 15 of the judgment and as to the while deciding the issue.
3. Despite the elaborate hearing, no error apparent on the face of the record is brought out to invoke the power of review. The judgment is a self contained one and the finding is supported by the reasons. The scope of review is very limited and in the absence of any error apparent on the face of record, it is not possible for this Court to make any interference. Review is not a substitute for appeal. We find support from the ruling rendered by the Apex Court in ***Smt. Meera Bhanja vs. Smt. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury*** reported in **AIR 1995 SC 455**.
4. Interference is declined. The review petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-

(P. R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge