



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**991 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 284 OF 2023
IN WP/13244/2023**

**MS TRIMURTI PAWAN PRATISHTHANS MEENATAI B THAKARE
GIRLS RURAL DED COLELGE**

VERSUS

ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUNDS COMMISSIONER

WITH

**REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 282 OF 2023
IN WP/13219/2023**

**MS TRIMURTI PAWAN PRATISHTHANS TRIMURTI PUBLIC
SCHOOL KHADKE**

VERSUS

ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUNDS COMMISSIONER

WITH

**REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 283 OF 2023
IN WP/13245/2023**

**MS TRIMURTI PAWAN PRATISHTHANS BOYS D.ED COLLEGE B.
B. THAKRE RURAL BOYS D. ED COLLEGE**

VERSUS

ASSISTANT PROVIDENT FUNDS COMMISSIONER

....

Mr. V. N. Upadhye, Advocate for the Review Applicants

Mr. N. K. Chaudhari, Advocate for the Respondent

....

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.**

DATE : 27.11.2025

ORDER (PER: Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.) :-

1. Heard at length Mr. Upadhye, learned counsel appearing for the review applicants and Mr. Choudhari, learned counsel appearing for the non-applicants Provident Fund Authority.

2. By the present applications, the applicants / original petitioners in all above three different writ petitions, seeking review of common order dated 20.10.2023, passed by this Court (Coram: Ravindra V. Ghuge and Y. G. Khobragade, JJ.), whereby, the aforesaid petitions are disposed off, however, while passing the order, this Court recorded the submissions canvassed on behalf of the the respondent Provident Fund Department that “*the petitioners have around 1000 employees and 35000 students admitted in almost 18 schools and 25 colleges*”, which are fully incorrect and misleading. Further, in paragraph 5, this Court observed that “*the petitioner is an organization which appears to have a huge workforce as well as a phenomenal strength of students, in about 37 institutions*”. The learned counsel appearing for the applicants submitted, the petitioner institutions are running 20 schools on permanent (no grant) basis with 5302 students from rural area and 143 staff members. Therefore, the workforce of 100 staffs and phenomenal strength of

35000 students as alleged by the respondent P. F. department is baseless, false and misleading. Therefore, prayed for review order of dated 20.10.2023 to the extent of above quoted observations in order dated 20.10.2023, particularly in paragraph Nos. 4 and 5.

3. Per contra, Mr. Chaudhari, the learned counsel appearing for the non-applicant P. F. Authority, canvassed that the portfolio of the petitioner schools, as displayed on its website, itself suggests that the petitioner educational institution has an enrollment of more than 35,000 students and has won more than 912 awards. More than 912 classes are completed and more than 1000 qualified students are engaged by the petitioner educational trust and running various schools at different places by engaging staff. Not only this but on 04.11.2022, an e-mail was received from unknown employee of the petitioner, wherein, it has been informed that the applicant Institution having teaching and non-teaching staff for the schools and colleges run by Trimurti Pawan Pratishthan trust. The applicant Institution is a very big group of schools and colleges and said trust runs 18 schools and 24 colleges in Ahmednagar and Amravati districts of Maharashtra. So also, many staff members are working since past many years, but they are never extended benefits of P. F. Therefore,

the learned counsel for the respondent, during the course of hearing of Writ Petition Nos. 13219, 13244 and 13245 of 2023, a statement was made upon information flashed by the management on its website and as such as on today, the Educational Trust/ management operates 18 schools and 24 colleges across Ahmednagar and Amravati districts by imparting education to more than 35,000 students. Therefore, the submissions recorded by this Court while passing order dated 20.10.2023, do not require any review. Hence, prayed for rejection of the review applications.

4. It is needless to say that the scope of review is very limited and unless the findings recorded by this Court, are shown to be contrary to the material placed on record, the review cannot be entertained. Further, the scope of review is limited and primarily serves to correct and apparent error on the face of record and it is very new and important evidence, or address other sufficient reason as contemplated under Section 114 and Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

5. It is well settled proposition of law that the review of order/judgment can be entertained when new and important

evidence is discovered by the applicant and the applicant was not in knowledge or due to negligence, not able to provide evidence when the order was passed. The power of review is available only when there is an error apparent on face of record and not on the erroneous decision.

6. By the present review applications, the petitioner educational institution prayed for review of the statements made on behalf of the respondent P. F. Authority about strength of the employees and the students as well as the institutions. However, the observations made by this Court while passing the order dated 20.10.2023 in paragraph Nos. 4 and 5, appears to be oral submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the respondent P. F. Authority in respect of its defense and said observations are not findings. The said observations do not appear to be an error apparent on the face of record. Therefore, the review applications are not tenable in eyes of law, hence, it is liable to be dismissed. In view of above discussion, all above review applications are dismissed.

[Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.]