



119
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RA-RS-2-2024 (O&M)
IN RSA-1793-2007
Date of Decision : 24.07.2024

Jai Pal Singh & Ors ... Appellant(s)
Versus
Ram Parshad & Ors ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
for review applicant-respondent No.1.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The regular second appeal was decided by this Court on 16.09.2016 by a detailed speaking order. The said order was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing SLP (C) No.1491 of 2017 which was dismissed vide order dated 07.03.2022. Subsequently, a review petition of the said order dated 07.03.2022 was filed before the Supreme Court being Review Petition No.691 of 2022 and the same was also dismissed vide order dated 19.07.2022. Thereafter, the present review application (RA-RS-2-2024) has been filed in the year 2024 i.e. after a delay of 2537 days in filing the review application and a delay of 58 days in refiling thereof.
2. By way of the present review application, the learned counsel for the review applicant-respondent No.1 is seeking to reopen the entire issue which has attained finality upto the Supreme Court. Not only SLP (C) No.1491 of 2017 was dismissed vide order dated 07.03.2022, but

even the Review Petition No.691 of 2022 was also dismissed vide order dated 19.07.2022. As noticed above, the present review application (**RA-RS-2-2024**) was also filed after a delay of 2537 days.

3. The counsel who has opted to file the present review application was not the counsel on behalf of respondent No.1 at the time of addressing the arguments on the regular second appeal which was decided vide a detailed order dated 16.09.2016. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has repeatedly deprecated the conduct of the parties in filing the review petitions through fresh counsel and support in this regard can be drawn from the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Om Parkash Vs. Suresh Kumar [2020 (13) SCC 188]** and **T.N. Electricity Board & Anr. Vs. N. Raju Reddiar & Anr. [1997 (9) SCC 736]**.

4. The review applicant-respondent No.1 herein in the garb of filing a review application cannot set at naught what has attained finality upto the Supreme Court. The only endeavour of the review applicant appears to be to indulge in forum shopping.

5. In view of the above, the present review application (**RA-RS-2-2024**) is dismissed with Rs.50,000/- as costs to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Bhiwani. In case the costs are not deposited, the same be recovered as arrears of land revenue. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

24.07.2024
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO