

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak

And

The Hon'ble Justice Md. Shabbar Rashidi

R.V.W. 161 of 2025

**Sri Ranjan Bandyopadhyay @
Ranjan Banerjee**

vs.

Bank of Baroda & Ors.

With

CAN 1 of 2025

In

F.M.A. 510 of 2024

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ranjan Bandyopadhyay (in person)

For the State : Mr. Apurba Kumar Bandyopadhyay
Ms. Shagufta Yasmin

Heard & Judgment on : **July 14, 2025**

DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-

1. Review applicant seeks review of a judgment and order dated May 1, 2025 passed in F.M.A. 510 of 2024.
2. Review applicant appears in person.
3. Review applicant refers to various portions of the judgment and order under review. He submits that the materials on record if appreciated in a different way, Court may arrive at a different conclusion than what is recorded in the judgment and order under review.
4. Bank is represented.

5. With deepest respect, we are not in a position to accept the contention of the review applicant. Review is not a substitute of an appeal. Under the garb of review, we are not called upon to sit in appeal over the judgment and order under review. According to the review applicant if the materials placed on record in the appeal are re-appreciated then a different conclusion may be arrived at. It is not the case of the review applicant that the conclusion arrived at and recorded in the judgment and order under review is not plausible on the basis of the materials made available on record.
6. Our attention is not drawn to any error apparent on the face of the record.
7. In such circumstances, we are not minded to exercise our jurisdiction of review.
8. R.V.W. 161 of 2025 and the connected application being CAN 1 of 2025 are dismissed without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

9. I agree

S.D.

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)