

20th May, 2025
(D/L No.15)
Ct. No.4
(SKB)

R.V.W.102 of 2025
With
CAN 1 of 2025
In
W.P.C.T. 9 of 2025

Raghunath Banerjee
Versus
The Union of India and others

Mr. A. K. Gayen,
Ms. A. A. Gayen,
Mr. M. Mukhopadhyay
....for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Suman Chattopadhyay,
Mr. Amal Kumar Datta
... for the Union of India.

1. Heard the learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.
2. The learned counsel for the applicant has made two fold submissions. Firstly, he has pointed out that there is a typographical error in the order dated 12th February, 2025 wherein after paragraph 8 the next paragraph has been numbered as 11 and thereafter the next paragraphs have been numbered as 12 and 13.
3. The error is apparent from a bare reading of the order itself. In view thereof, we direct that the paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 be read as 9, 10 and 11 in the court's order dated 12th February, 2025.

4. The review application is pressed on the ground that the court has recorded the petitioner's acceptance of the promotion w.e.f. 30.10.2015 without any demur whereas the petitioner's representation was there on the records in the writ petition. He has referred to the representation dated 25.06.2020.
5. We have gone through the same. It does not change the facts and circumstances of the case as a representation of 2020 cannot be said to be an objection with respect to the discharge of the duties of the higher post by the petitioner in the year 2015. The representation was filed even much after the petitioner's retirement on 30.04.2017. No ground is made out for review of the order dated 12th February, 2025.
6. The review application is thus dismissed.
7. Accordingly, the application being CAN 1 of 2025 is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)