

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA
REVIEW. PET. NO.21 OF 2024**

Shri Radheshyam Debnath
Vs.
The State of Tripura and ors.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T. AMARNATH GOUD

Present:

For the Petitioner(s)	: Mr. P.K. Pal, Advocate. Ms. M. Majumder, Advocate. Ms. M. Chanda, Advocate.
For the Respondent(s)	: Mr. M. Debbarma, Addl. G.A. Mr. K. De, Addl. G.A. Mr. N. Majumder, Advocate.

12.09.2024

Order

This present Petition has been filed to review Paras-4 and 5 of the impugned Judgment & Order dated 04.07.2024 passed in W.P.(C) 448 of 2024.

2. Heard Mr. P.K. Pal, learned counsel assisted by Ms. M. Majumder, learned counsel, and Ms. M. Chanda, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as Mr. M. Debbarma and Mr. K. De, learned Addl. G.As., appearing for the State-respondents. Also heard Mr. N. Majumder, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4.

3. Mr. P.K. Pal, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that while disposing of the connected WP(C) No.448 of 2024, vide Order dated 04.07.2024, in para No.5, this Court inadvertently has directed respondents to consider the case of the petitioner in the light of the communication dated

21.12.2023 and 22.05.2024. The correct date of the communication would be **20.12.2023** and 22.05.2024. The 2nd half of the argument of Mr. Pal, learned counsel is that the connected writ petition No.448 of 2024 be allowed as it is covered by earlier Order passed by this Court in favour of a similarly situated person in WP(C) No.191 of 2020.

4. Heard and perused the evidence on record.

5. Upon considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds merit in the limited request for correction of the date. Accordingly, the date "21.12.2023" in the original order dated 04.07.2024 passed in WP(C) No.448 of 2023 is hereby modified to "20.12.2023."

6. However, the arguments advanced by the counsel for the petitioner that the writ petition is covered by an earlier order passed in a different writ petition are found to be without merit. The review petition, on this ground, does not disclose any error apparent on the face of the record as no impugned order has been challenged in the writ petition. Accordingly, the same does not fall within the permissible grounds for review. Therefore, the review petition stands dismissed.

7. Further, considering the frivolous nature of the arguments made by the petitioner, a cost of Rs.5000/- only is imposed on the petitioner, to be paid to the account of **Tripura**

High Court Bar Association within 30 days from the date of this order.

8. As a sequel, stay if any stands vacated. Pending application, if any also stands closed.

9. Copy of this Order to be furnished to the **Secretary, Tripura High Court Bar Association.**

JUDGE



suhanjit

RAJKUMAR
SUHANJIT
SINGHA

Digitally signed by
RAJKUMAR SUHANJIT
SINGHA
Date: 2024.09.13 12:36:22
+05'30'