

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION NO.64 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.14320 OF 2024**

Shri Devi Shantadurga and
Ravalnath Mandir Trust
Through its Trustee President
Laxman Dharmaji Palav

....Petitioner

V/S

Sudhakar Laxman Palav & Ors.

....Respondents

Dr. D.S. Hatle *a/w Mr. Deepak Jamsandekar, Ms. Nirmiti K. Lawane for the Review Petitioner.*

**CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.
DATE : 9 APRIL 2025.**

P.C.:

1. The present Review Petition is filed seeking review of order dated 26 February 2025.

2. I have heard Mr. Hatle, the learned counsel appearing for the Review Petitioner at some length. He would draw my attention to the Change Report No.256 of 2022 by which change relating to the Trustees for the period 11 June 2022 to 6 June 2027 is sought to be reported. He would submit that the Assistant Charity Commissioner is yet to decide the said Change Report No.256 of 2022, but has erroneously come to a conclusion that there is no Governing Council as of now to whom the records of the Trust can be handed over.

3. However, perusal of the main Writ Petition would indicate that copy of Change Report No.256 of 2022 was never produced alongwith the Petition. There is no averment in the Petition that Change Report No.256 of 2022 is pending or that without deciding that Change Report, the Application under Section 41A of the Maharashtra Public Trust Act, 1950 could not have been decided by the Assistant Charity Commissioner. Thus what is sought to be done by way of filing the present Review Petition is to raise new contentions and produce new documents, which were never brought to the notice of this Court while passing the order dated 26 February 2025. This Court has upheld the order passed by the Assistant Charity Commissioner by taking into consideration the pleadings in the memo of the Petition and documents attached alongwith the same. There is no averment that at the time of decision of the main Petition, Petitioner was prevented by any valid reason from producing the additional documents, which are now sought to be produced.

4. Review of the order cannot be sought by relying on additional documents. No case is made out for review of the Order. Filing of the present Review Petition is gross abuse of process of law. Valuable judicial time is wasted in hearing and deciding the present Review Petition, which is filed without even bothering to examine whether the documents, which are now sought to be produced, formed part of the main Petition or not. In that view of the matter, while dismissing the Review Petition, costs are required to be imposed. Review Petition is accordingly

dismissed by imposing costs of Rs.10,000/-. Costs to be paid by the Petitioner to Kirtikar Law Library, Fort, Mumbai, within a period of four weeks.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Digitally signed
by SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Date:
2025.04.15
14:12:45 +0530