

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

(114)

**RA-RS No.12 of 2023 in
RSA No.618 of 2021
Date of Decision : 24.03.2023**

Rupinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Sushil Azad and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate and
Mr. Deepanshu Sharma, Advocate
for the appellant.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

In the present review application, the prayer of the appellant is to reappreciate the argument qua signature of the husband on the demarcation report so as to arrive at a different conclusion than one arrived at in the order dated 20.02.2023.

The present application has been filed for review of the order dated 20.02.2023, however, review is only permissible in case any incorrect fact has been taken into account to arrive at a conclusion. The findings recorded in the order and by considering the argument raised whether the findings are correct or incorrect will be subject matter in the appeal in case the appellant/review applicant is aggrieved in any manner qua the order dated 20.02.2023. Under the garb of review, the Regular Second Appeal cannot be argued again so as to convince the Court to arrive at a different conclusion.

No ground is made out for grant of the prayer as made in the present application

Dismissed.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that even when the appeal was argued on 20.02.2023, he had also appeared with Mr. Deepanshu Sharma, Advocate but inadvertently the presence of Mr. Deepanshu Sharma, Advocate has been marked for Mr. Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate. Qua the said fact, in the order dated 20.02.2023, the presence of Mr. Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate be treated to be recorded along with Mr. Deepanshu Sharma, Advocate.

March 24, 2023
jt

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No