

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

101

**RA-LP-8-2022 in LPA-262-2020
Decided on : 08.07.2022**

Joga Singh

.....Appellant (s)

Versus

Punjab State Electricity Board and another

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE G.S. SANDHAWALIA
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE HARINDER SINGH SIDHU**

Present: Mr. Vishal Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the review applicant/appellant.

G.S. Sandhawalia, J. (Oral)

The order dated 28.02.2020 is sought to be reviewed by the appellant through a legal-aid counsel. Apparently the review has not been filed by the original counsel. The Apex Court in the case **T.N. Electricity Board and another Vs. N. Raju Reddiar and another, 1997 AIR (SC) 1005** has held that filing of review application through a new counsel is not permissible. Relevant observations made in the said case read as under:-

“2. Once the petition for review is dismissed, no application for clarification should be filed, much less with the change of the advocate-on-record. This practice of changing the advocates and filing repeated petitions should be deprecated with heavy hand for purity of administration of law and salutary and healthy practice.

3. The application is dismissed with exemplary costs of Rs. 20,000/- as it is an abuse of the process of Court in derogation of healthy practice. The amount should be paid to the Supreme Court Legal Aid Services Committee within four months from today. If the amount is not paid, it should be recovered treating this direction as decree of the Court by the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee. The Registry is directed to communicate this order to the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee. Application dismissed.”

Even otherwise nothing could be pointed on merits as such qua the order which is sought to be reviewed, as admittedly the appellant had remained absent for 7 years and never joined the departmental proceedings, which eventually led to termination of his service.

In such circumstances, we are of the considered opinion that the order does not suffer from any infirmity which would warrant interference under the provisions of review. Resultantly, the review application stands dismissed.

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

July 08, 2022
Naveen

(HARINDER SINGH SIDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No