

23.06.2025
Item No. 36
Ct. No. 30
AN

**RVW 80 of 2025
with
CAN 1 of 2025
In
WPA 27817 of 2023**

**Dilip Kumar Chowdhury
vs.
Regional P. F. Commissioner, Durgapur & ors.**

Mr. Harisankar Chattopadhyay

... for the applicant

Mr. Anil Kr. Gupta

... for P. F. Authorities

Mrs. Sanjukta Dutta

Mr. Ronit Roy

... for respondent HCL

The revisionist in the review application is the petitioner in the present case.

The review application has been preferred challenging the findings of this Court at paragraph 13 of the judgment and order dated 31.01.2025.

The petitioner submits that after the said order was passed, he filed a RTI application before the authority and has received a response, which is not in accordance with paragraph 13 of the judgment under review.

It appears that the grounds for review as made out are not grounds for a review. The petitioner has agitated events which are subsequent to the judgment and order against which review has been preferred and subsequent events are not a ground for review.

Considering the grounds on which review has been prayed for, it appears that the review application is clearly an appeal in disguise as there is no error apparent on the face of the record.

The petitioner in the review application has sought to re-appreciate the materials on record which is not permissible under the forum of review, there being no prima facie misconception of fact or law in the judgment/order under review. **(S. Murali Sundaram vs. Jothibai Kannan & Ors., (2023) 13 SCC 515, Para 16, 17 & 23)**

Hence, there being no error apparent on the face of the record, the review application stands **dismissed**.

CAN 1 of 2025 is disposed of.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)