

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**REVP No. 72 of 2020**

1. Omprakash Sahare S/o Dagoji Sahare Aged About 43 Years Bakhtavar Chal Tulsipur, Rajnandgaon, Jila Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Dr. R.K. Mandavi Principal, Shaskiya Lal Chakradhar Shah Mahavidyalaya, Ambagarh Chowki, Jila Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Omprakash Sahare, Petitioner in person

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****04.01.2021**

1. The present review petition has been filed seeking review of an order dated 07.01.2020 passed in contempt case No. 179/2019.
2. The review petition has been preferred on the ground of certain facts have not been appreciated by this Court nor have they been properly placed by the respondents or their counsels and therefore the order needs to be reviewed.
3. Perusal of the contents of the order dated 07.01.2020, review of which is being sought clearly shows that in the course of proceedings, it was reflected that the services of the petitioner were discontinued w.e.f. 01.05.2018 which fact was not brought to the notice of the Writ Court when the interim order was granted on 31.07.2018 in WP(S) No. 7525 of 2017.
4. This Court in the given factual matrix of the case had disposed of the contempt petition, reserving the right of the petitioner to challenge the order of discontinuance / termination.

5. This Court was of the firm view that the contention which was brought before the Court made it evident that it does not amount to a Contempt. Now the option available for the petitioner was to challenge the alleged discontinuance, if any, by way of a fresh writ petition or if he was not satisfied with the order passed in the contempt petition, the petitioner should have challenged the same before the Higher Court.
6. Review of an order can only be on an error apparent on the face of records. The pleadings enclosed along with the review petition do not reflect any error apparent on the face of records. The order seems to have been passed purely based upon the submission made by counsel appearing on either side to the writ petition.
7. The review petition therefore would not be maintainable and the same deserved to be rejected and is accordingly rejected. Reserving the right of the petitioner still to avail other remedies available to him as has been mentioned in the order passed in the Contempt Petition.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge