



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5039 OF 2025
IN RAST/39021/2023

UTTAM RAM BANDGAR AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
ANANDRAO NAIK PRATHAMIK ASHRAM SHALA AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Anandsingh S. Bayas

...

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.

Date : 17th November, 2025

ORDER :-

Civil Application No. 5039 of 2025

1. Heard.
2. For the reasons stated in the application, the application for condonation of delay is hereby allowed.

Review Application No. 39021 of 2023

3. The applicant seeks review of the order dated 13.06.2017 rendered by this Court in Writ Petition No. 1964 of 2009.
4. Heard learned counsel for applicant.
5. Having considered the contentions put forth by the

learned counsel for applicant, I have perused the order under review.

6. *It is well settled law that review petition has very limited scope and party seeking review cannot canvas the original proceeding as like the writ petition before the Court, as has been laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Lily Thomas Vs. Union of India (AIR 2000 SC 1650)**.*

7. *It is further well settled position of law that the scope of review jurisdiction is limited only to correct the error of law leading to manifest injustice, as has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Telangana Vs. Mohammad Abdul Karim [(2024)6 SCC 461]**.*

8. *The learned counsel for petitioner has attempted to re-agitate and re-argue the ground mentioned in the writ petition. As stated hereinabove, it is trite that it is not open for any of the party to re-agitate the grounds those are already raised and considered while deciding the original proceeding.*

9. *An error on the face of record must be such an error which, mere looking at the record should strike and does not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on the points where*

there may conceivably be two opinions. The same is attempted by the learned counsel for applicant by filing this review application, is impermissible in law. The applicant is unable to point out error much less error of law, apparent on the face of record.

10. In view of the afore-stated aspect, no error is noted in the order dated 13.06.2017 under review.

11. Resultantly, the review application sans merit and accordingly, the same stands dismissed. However, no order as to costs.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

Omkar Joshi