

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 5537 OF 2025
IN
REVIEW PETITION NO. 4 OF 2025

Shrikant B. Hegde

...Applicant

V/s.

Rangnath A. Haridas

...Respondent

Dr. Veerendra Tulzapurkar, Senior Advocate with Mr. Mandar Soman
i/b Ms. Minakshi Surve for the Applicant.

CORAM : ABHAY AHUJA, J.
DATE : 19th NOVEMBER, 2025

PC. :

1. This Interim Application seeks condonation of delay in filing
Review Petition in respect of the order dated 21st July, 2025.

2. Mr. Tulzapurkar, learned Senior Counsel appears for the
Applicant and submits that there is a delay of 25 days in filing the
Review Petition and the same condoned as although the order was
passed on 21st July, 2025, the Petitioner learnt about the same when a
copy of the order given to the Petitioner on 31st July, 2025.

3. It is submitted that the delay of 25 days is due to circumstances
beyond the control of the Applicant. It is submitted that the Applicant

was not present in Court when the order is passed and without seeking instructions from the Petitioner, the Advocate for the Petitioner withdrew the Application. That the Petitioner was neither consulted nor informed of such withdrawal. Thereafter, the Applicant explored all the legal avenues open to him and finally after engaging the Advocate he was advised in the first week of September to file a Review Petition. That, therefore, there has been a delay in filing the Review Petition, which delay is not intentional. Mr. Tulzapurkar submits that if the delay is not condoned serious prejudice would be caused to the Respondent.

4. Learned Court Associate informs that the affidavit of service indicates that service could not be effected as the packets have been returned with the remark “no such person in the address” and that “the packet could not be delivered.

5. Mr. Tulzapurkar, learned Senior Counsel submits that even in the main matter packets had been returned with the similar remark. That, this Court, therefore, condone the delay and hear the Review Petition.

6. Having heard the learned Senior Counsel and having considered his submissions, this Court is of the view that for reasons as submitted

before this Court and as contained in the Interim Application, the delay of 25 days in filing the Review Petition be condoned.

7. The Interim Application is accordingly allowed in terms of prayer Clause (a), which reads thus:-

“(a) That this Hon’ble Court be pleased to condone the delay of 25 days in filing the review petition.”

8. The Interim Application accordingly stands allowed and disposed as above.

9. List the Review Petition for hearing on **5th December, 2025 on the Supplementary Board.**

(ABHAY AHUJA, J.)