

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO.14 OF 2023 IN WRIT PETITION NO.1981 OF 2005

ALONG WITH

REVIEW PETITION NO.15 OF 2023 IN WRIT PETITION NO.46 OF 2006

Tulsidas K. Raipat

.. Review Petitioner

Vs.

Vashu Bhagnani and Anr.

.. Respondents

Mr. Atul Damle, with Ms. Bina Jariwala, i/by Auroma Law, for the Review Petitioner-Original Petitioner in both the Review Petitions.

Mr. Tahir Prande, i/by Juris Consil lis, for Respondent No.1 in RPW/14/2023.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE & M.M. SATHAYE, JJ

DATE : 15TH JUNE, 2023.

[IN CHAMBER]

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.
2. No case whatsoever has been made out to enable us to hold that there is an error apparent on the face of the record in the orders sought to be reviewed in both these petitions. Of course, learned counsel for the petitioner was absent and there may be justifiable reason on his part, which may have compelled him to remain absent. But, it has to be understood that the absence of the Advocate was not the only reason for dismissing the petition. The documents placed on record and the averments of the parties were also taken into consideration. It

was also noticed that the occupation certificate, which was the pivot of the issues raised in both these petitions, was not challenged till then. In the circumstances, we find no merit in both these review petitions.

3. Accordingly, the review petitions stand dismissed. However, it would be open for the petitioner to challenge the occupation certificate by filing appropriate proceedings.

[M.M. SATHAYE, J.]

[SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.]