

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: W.A.Nos.966 and 967 of 2005

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
9.	11.01.2024	<u>CJ & JAK,J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2019 in W.A.No.966 of 2005</u> <u>and</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2019 in W.A.No.967 of 2005</u> Mr. K.Laxmaiah, learned counsel for the appellant. Heard on I.A.No.1 of 2019 in W.A.No.966 of 2005 and I.A.No.1 of 2019 in W.A.No.967 of 2005. For the reasons assigned in the applications, duly supported by the affidavits, we find that sufficient cause on condonation of delay of 1304 days in presenting the review petition in W.A.No.966 of 2005 and 1261 days in presenting the review petition in W.A.No.967 of 2005 is made out. In the result, delay in presenting the review petitions is condoned and the interlocutory applications are allowed. CJ (AAJ) JAK,J (contd..in next page)	Transferred to i/o folder, before corrections, if any.

		<u>Review I.A.No.2 of 2019 in W.A.No.966 of 2005</u> <u>and</u> <u>Review I.A.No.2 of 2019 in W.A.No.967 of 2005</u> Mr. K.Laxmaiah, learned counsel for the appellant/review petitioner. Heard on the review applications seeking review of the order dated 21.01.2016 passed by a Division Bench of this Court in W.A.Nos.966 and 967 of 2005. We have heard learned counsel for the appellant/review petitioner at length. The Election Tribunal, on the basis of the evidence adduced before it, has concluded that the appellant/review petitioner had three children as on the cut off date. The aforesaid finding of fact has been affirmed by the learned Single Judge of this Court by order dated 28.03.2005. The aforesaid finding of fact could not be demonstrated to be perverse. Even otherwise, the order under review neither suffers from any jurisdictional infirmity nor any error apparent on the face of the record.	
--	--	---	--

		In the result, we do not find any merit in the review applications. The same are hereby dismissed. <u>CJ (AAJ)</u> <u>JAK,J</u> vs	
--	--	--	--