

AGK

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION NO.6 OF 2023
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO.343 OF 2021**

Ratanshi Ugamshi Satra, through
its constituted attorney
Ramji Ratanshi Satra

... Petitioner

V/s.

Municipal Corporation of Greater
Mumbai, through K/West Ward,
Andheri, Mumbai & Anr.

... Respondents

Mr. Ankit Lohia with Ms. Isha Bafna i/by Jayakar &
Partners for the petitioner.

Mr. Santosh Parad for respondent no.1/MCGM.

ATUL
GANESH
KULKARNI
Digitally signed by
ATUL GANESH
KULKARNI
Date: 2023.04.24
14:57:36 +0530

CORAM : AMIT BORKAR, J.

DATED : APRIL 24, 2023

PC.:

- 1.** Review is sought on the ground that the Trial Court has not considered material documents as regards allotment of structure by the Statutory Authority.
- 2.** On perusal of the review application, such ground is not raised; however, even if such ground is raised during course of hearing, such ground in the facts of the case would fall beyond the purview of error “apparent on the face of record”.
- 3.** Parameters for review have been succinctly laid down by the

Apex Court in **Meera Bhanja v. Nirmala Kumari Coudhury** reported in AIR 1995 SC 455. The Apex Court has held that the error apparent on the face of record must be such an error which must strike on mere looking at the record and would not require long-drawn process of reasoning on points where there may conceivably be two opinions.

4. Neither grounds pleaded nor ground urged falls within the category “apparent on the face of record”.

5. The order impugned is illegal is no ground to interfere the review petition. The review petitioner, therefore, stands dismissed. No costs.

(AMIT BORKAR, J.)