
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION NO.177 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 8454 OF 2019

Laxman Dattatray Shinde

.. Petitioner/Orig.Petitioner

Versus

Union of India & Ors

.. Respondents

Mr. Arshad Shaikh, Senior Advocate with *Mr. Rajendra Jain, Ranjit Agashe, Aniket Pardeshi, Amit Sharma, Ms. Renu More i/b Pankaj Thatte, Advocates for the Petitioner.*

CORAM: B. P. COLABAWALLA &
AMIT BORKAR, JJ.
DATE: DECEMBER 15, 2025
(IN CHAMBERS)

ANJALI
TUSHAR
ASWALE

Digitally signed
by ANJALI
TUSHAR
ASWALE
Date: 2025.12.19
14:36:41 +0530

P. C.

1. The above Review Petition is filed seeking a review of the order dated 19th June 2024 passed by a Bench of which one of us (Amit Borkar, J.) was a party. The review sought is basically in relation to the figures that are mentioned in paragraph 15 of the order under review.

2. According to the Petitioner, the figure mentioned as “31 vacancies” is incorrect, and which should actually be “59 vacancies”. This

submission is made on the basis that the information received by the Petitioner under the Right to Information Act, 2005, the vacancies are 59 and not 31. This mistake needs to be corrected according to the Review Petitioner.

3. We find that this argument cannot be accepted for the simple reason that in paragraph 15 read with paragraph 19 of the order under review, this Court has already opined that it does not have any reason to doubt the vacancy position of the post in question because the Respondents are the best person to know the number of vacancies and other related information in respect of this establishment. In paragraph 19, this Court categorically held that merely on account of some information which appears to have been wrongly furnished to the Petitioner under the Right to Information Act 2005, it cannot be said that total number of vacancies in the department were 59. Once this is the finding given by the Court in paragraph 19, it is clear that the correction sought by the Review Petitioner to the figures mentioned in paragraph 15 cannot be allowed. If the Petitioner is aggrieved by the finding given in paragraph 19 of the order under review, the remedy lies elsewhere and not by way of a review.

4. In these circumstances, we find no merit in the Review Petition. It is accordingly dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

5. This order will be digitally signed by the Private Secretary/ Personal Assistant of this Court. All concerned will act on production by fax or email of a digitally signed copy of this order.

[AMIT BORKAR, J.]

[B. P. COLABAWALLA, J.]