

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Review Petition No. 65 of 2021**

Sanjay Singh S/o Late Shivpal Singh, Aged About 60 Years, Working As General Manager, Chhattisgarh Tourism Board, Udyog Bhavan, Telibandha, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Tourism Mahanadi Bhavan, Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Tourism Board Through Its Managing Director, 2nd Floor Udyog Bhavan, Ring Road No. 1, Telibandha, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh Tourism Board, 2nd Floor, Udyog Bhavan, Ring Road No. 1, Telibandha Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Manish Nigam, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Akanksha Jain. Dy. Govt. Advocate
For Respondents 2 & 3	:	Mr. Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****06.04.2021**

1. The present review petition has been filed seeking review of the order dated 16.02.2021 passed by this Court in WPS No. 707 of 2021.
2. The writ petition was primarily filed questioning 3 orders; One dated 18.04.2020 whereby the State Govt. decided to initiate disciplinary proceeding against the petitioner. Secondly, the order dated 11.11.2020 whereby the petitioner was placed under suspension and thirdly the order dated 23.12.2020 whereby the respondents issued a charge-sheet to the petitioner.

3. This Court after considering all the contentions of the petitioner vide order dated 16.02.2021 had dismissed the said writ petition. The review petition now has been filed only on the ground that certain ground which had been raised by the petitioner in the writ petition does not seem to have been reflected or discussed by this Court in the course of deciding the matter. Therefore, learned counsel for the petitioner prayed that the review petition be entertained, the order be recalled and the matter be heard and in the course of hearing, the ground which had been taken up by the petitioner in his writ petition be also discussed while deciding the review petition.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents 2 & 3 opposing the review petition submits that all the grounds raised by the petitioner are not one which could be entertained under the Review jurisdiction of this Court and even on merits, the case of the petitioner has been dealt with and considered by this Court while deciding the writ petition.
5. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that the ground raised by the petitioner seeking review is not one which would be permissible under the review jurisdiction of this Court. If the petitioner was not satisfied with the findings given by this Court, the only option available to the petitioner is one that of the remedy of appeal. Non discussion of a ground in the judgment cannot be a ground for entertaining a review petition.
6. The review petition thus being devoid of merits deserves to be and is accordingly rejected.

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