



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.177 OF 2025

AND

MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION ST. NO.698 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.1405 OF 2018 (D)

WITH

CONTEMPT PETITION NO.24 OF 2025 (P)

Central Provident Fund Commissioner, Bhikaji Cama Place, New Delhi and ors.

-vs-

Waman s/o Kshirsagar Nandanwar, Thakre Nagar, Aurangabad and ors.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and the Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Shri Nitin Choudhari, Advocate for the applicant/original respondent No.1.
Shri R. S. Parsodkar, Advocate for non-applicant No.1/original petitioner.
Shri N. S. Rao, Assistant Government Pleader for non-applicant Nos.2 and 3/
original respondent Nos.2 and 3.

CORAM : NTIN W. SAMBRE AND ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.

DATE : May 07, 2025

1. Amongst other, ground cited in support of the prayer for condonation of delay is that initially opinion was formed to prefer Special Leave Petition however, subsequently pursuant to legal advise it was decided to prefer the present review application.
2. Apart from above when confronted, the learned counsel for the applicant on merits submits that the view expressed by this Court is in ignorance of the proper appreciation of the judgments which were cited before this Court.
3. We are required to be sensitive to the scope of review jurisdiction. An appropriate reliance can be placed on the observations made by the Apex Court in paragraph 20 of the judgment in the matter

of *Kamlesh Verma vs. Mayawati and ors. (2013) 8 SCC 320*.

4. As such, merely because the appreciation of law by this Court is not convenient or as per the expectation of the review applicant, that cannot be a ground for exercise of review jurisdiction.

5. Apart from above, we are required to be equally sensitive to the conduct of the review applicant of not questioning the judgments, based on which this Court has taken a similar view.

6. That being so, not only the application for condonation of delay is devoid of merits but also the review application. As such, both the applications stand rejected with costs of Rs.25,000/-.

(Abhay J. Mantri, J.)

(Nitin W. Sambre, J.)