

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR THE STATE OF
TELANGANA
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA**

Rev.I.A.No. 1 of 2024
IN
WRIT PETITION No. 3773 OF 2012

29.01.2026

Between:

P. Narsing Rao

..... Petitioner

And

The Telangana State Southern Power Distribution
Company Ltd. of Telangana
& others

..... Respondents

ORDER:

Petitioner, who was unsuccessful in Writ Petition,
as filed this Application to review the order dated 11.1.2024
raising several factual grounds.

2. Learned counsel for Review Petitioner Sri Anuganti
Praneeth submits that this Court, while passing the order
under Review, did not take into consideration the fact that the
Enquiry Officer has not conducted enquiry by following the
procedure contemplated under Regulation 10 of APSEB (D&A)
Regulations and therefore, the enquiry should be held to be
vitiating. It is also contended that based on the said enquiry
report, the disciplinary authority imposed punishment which is
also vitiating.

2.1. Learned counsel relied upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Satyendra Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh¹**, **Allahabad Bank v. Krishna Narayan Tewari²**, to show that the departmental enquiry was not conducted as per the Regulations, hence, the enquiry and the consequential order of punishment stood vitiated. It is therefore, urged that this Writ Petition has to be allowed.

3. Learned Standing Counsel for Respondents Sri N. Sreedhar Reddy contended that an Application for review can be made under Section 114 of CPC, strictly on the grounds enumerated under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC and cannot transgress beyond the same. It is further contended that petitioner has raised grounds which ought to have been raised in the Writ Petition and not in the Review Petition. He placed reliance on the judgment rendered in **Sanjay Kumar Agarwal v State Tax Officer³**, **Government of NCT of Delhi v K.L.Rathi Steels Limited⁴** and **S. Thirupathi Rao v. M. Lingamaiah⁵**.

4. It is a well settled principle that a party is not entitled to seek review of the judgment merely for the purpose of re-hearing and a fresh decision of the case. The normal principle

¹ 2024 SCC Online SC 3325

² (2017) 2 Supreme Court Cases 308

³ (2024) 2 SCC 362

⁴ (2024) 7 Supreme Court Cases 315

⁵ 2024 SCC Online SC 1764

is that a judgment pronounced by a Court is final and departure from that principle is justified only when circumstances of a substantial and compelling character make it necessary to do so. Moreover, under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, a judgment may be open to review only on three grounds viz.(1) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence, or (2) Mistake or error apparent on the face of record, or (3) Any other sufficient reason. 'Any other sufficient reason' is interpreted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above referred cases referring to traditional view in Chhajju Ram's case. The words 'any other sufficient reason' means a reason sufficient on grounds at least analogous to those specified immediately previously, meaning thereby, No. (1) & (2) of Order 47 Rule 1 referred to above. All the grounds raised by petitioner are factual in nature and many of them were not even pleaded in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition. Therefore it cannot even be contended, by raising new grounds, that an error apparent on the face of record has occurred. The grounds of Review Petition are silent as to on what specific ground referable to Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. Review has been asked for. Learned Counsel for Petitioner has argued as if he was arguing in the Writ Petition and not confining to the grounds of Review Petition under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the

order under review does not suffer from any error apparent on the face of record.

5. It is necessary to point out that petitioner, after dismissal of Writ Petition, filed Writ Appeal No. 319 of 2024 which was dismissed by the Division Bench of this Court as withdrawn by order dated 30.4.2024, granting liberty to petitioner to pursue his remedies in accordance with law. Therefore having preferred a Writ Appeal and withdrew the same, petitioner is not entitled to file the present Review Petition, more so, without specifically pointing out as to under which grounds of Order 47 Rule 1 of CPC there is an error apparent on the face of record.

6. Viewed from any angle, the Review Petition is not maintainable in law and the same is accordingly dismissed.

NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA, J

29th January 2026

ksld

