



**RA-CW-318-2017 in
CWP-23465-2013**

1

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

(230)

**RA-CW-318-2017 in
CWP-23465-2013
Date of Decision : August 01, 2024**

Bant Singh and another

.. Non-applicant/ Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.. Applicant/respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Amarpreet Singh Bains, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab, for the applicant/respondents.

Mr. J.S. Lalli, Advocate, with
Mr. Manish Verma, Advocate, for non-applicant/petitioners.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present review application, the prayer of the applicant/respondents is for recalling the order dated 08.02.2017 by which, the present writ petition was allowed in terms of ***CWP No.20821 of 2008 titled as Gurinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 26.07.2010.***

2. Learned counsel for the applicant-respondents submits that the benefit was wrongly allowed in the case of Gurinder Singh hence, the present petition should not have been allowed in terms of ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra).***



**RA-CW-318-2017 in
CWP-23465-2013**

2

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the non-applicant/petitioners submits that the judgment in ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)*** has already been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and the benefit also granted to the petitioner therein.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant/respondents has not been able to rebut the fact that the present writ petition and ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)*** involves the same facts.

6. The benefit being withdrawn from the petitioners herein and in ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)*** was identical and relief claimed in both the petitions is same and the judgment in ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)*** has already been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Once, the present petition has already been disposed of in terms of ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)***, the applicant/respondents cannot file a review to contend that the judgment in ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)*** was not correct and another opportunity be given to them to address the arguments.

7. Learned counsel for the applicant/respondents submits that one wrong should not lead to another wrong.

8. This argument cannot be accepted.

9. By raising this argument, State is raising a finger towards the judgment in ***Gurinder Singh's case (supra)***, which judgment has already been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. Hence, no ground is made out for any review of the order dated 08.02.2017 especially when no



**RA-CW-318-2017 in
CWP-23465-2013**

3

factual error has been pointed out in the judgment and under the garb of review, the applicant-respondents cannot re-argue the writ petition so as to convince the Court to arrive at different conclusion than the one arrived at in the order review of which is sought.

10. Accordingly, the review application stands dismissed.

August 01, 2024
harsha

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No