

(This is the corrected copy of the order)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO. 126 OF 2024

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 7868 OF 2022

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 13608 OF 2024

IN

REVIEW PETITION NO. 126 OF 2024

Narendra Babarao Deshmukh

....*Petitioner*

: *Versus* :

Becharbhai Jivabhai Patel and Ors.

....*Respondents*

Mr. Narendra B. Deshmukh, *Petitioner appearing in person.*

CORAM : SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

Dated : 7 March 2025.

P.C. :

1) The Petitioner has filed the present petition seeking review of the order dated 19 June 2024.

2) I have heard the Petitioner appearing in person and have considered the submissions canvassed by him.

3) The Petitioner in person has taken me through various judgments in order to buttress his contention that the view taken by various Coordinate Benches of this Court that open piece of land is not covered by definition of the term '*premises*' under Section 7(9) of the

Maharashtra Rent Control Act, 1999 is erroneous. He has also taken me through some of the judgments in support of his contention that if a law is declared in a particular judgment in absence of a party, such affected party can seek recall of such judgment.

4) In short, the Petitioner has argued the Review Petition as if the same is an Appeal in disguise. The whole attempt of the Petitioner in person during the course of his submissions was to urge taking of a different view by this Court than the one taken while passing order dated 19 June 2024. I am afraid, this cannot be done in exercise of review jurisdiction. No error apparent on the face of the record is traced in the order dated 19 June 2024. No other ground for exercise of review jurisdiction is made out in the petition.

5) The Petitioner in person has urged before me that the present Review Petition, as well as the main petition, needs to be referred to the Hon'ble Chief Justice for being placed either before a Division Bench or a larger Bench under Chapter-I Rule 8 of the High Court (Appellate Side) Rules. However, since no ground is made out for review of the order dated 19 June 2024, there is no question of entertaining the prayer for placing the Review Petition or the main petition before the Division Bench or a larger Bench. Resultantly, the Review Petition is **rejected**.

6) With rejection of Review Petition, Interim Application does not survive. The same also stands disposed of.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]

Note : Corrections are carried in cause-title only pursuant to speaking to minutes order dated 28 April 2025.