



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT NAGPUR

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW)
NO. 536 OF 2025

IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1771 OF 2019

GANESH S/O SHAMRAOJI BHARADBHUNJE
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Advocate for the Applicant : Mr. S. R. Narnaware a/w Dr. Prakash
T. Kosankar

Advocate for Respondents No. 2 to 4 : Mr. V. P. Maldhure

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH AND
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.
(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE)

Dated : 11th November, 2025

ORDER (Per : Sachin S. Deshmukh, J) :-

1. The applicant seeks review of the order dated 24.06.2025 rendered by this Court in Writ Petition No. 1771 of 2019.
2. Heard learned counsel for applicant.
3. Having considered the contentions put forth by the learned counsel for applicant, we have perused the order under review.
4. It is well settled law that review petition has very

limited scope and party seeking review cannot canvas the original proceeding as like the writ petition before the Court, as has been laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Lily Thomas Vs. Union of India (AIR 2000 SC 1650)**.

5. It is further well settled position of law that the scope of review jurisdiction is limited only to correct the error of law leading to manifest injustice, as has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Telangana Vs. Mohammad Abdul Karim [(2024)6 SCC 461]**.

6. The learned counsel for petitioner has attempted to re-agitate and re-argue the ground mentioned in the writ petition. As stated hereinabove, it is trite that it is not open for any of the party to re-agitate the grounds those are already raised and considered while deciding the original proceeding.

7. The Committee has taken into account the oldest entry of 08.09.1942, whereas the petitioner is relying on the subsequent entry which is considered by this Court. Thus, under the pretext of review, the applicant cannot be permitted to re-agitate and re-argue the questions those have already been addressed and decided.

8. An error on the face of record must be such an error which, mere looking at the record should strike and does not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on the points where there may conceivably be two opinions. The same is attempted by the learned counsel for applicant by filing this review application, is impermissible in law. The applicant is unable to point out error much less error of law, apparent on the face of record.

9. In view of the afore-stated aspect, no error is noted in the order dated 24.06.2025 under review.

10. Resultantly, the review application *sans* merit and accordingly, the same stands dismissed. However, no order as to costs.

(VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, J.) (SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

Omkar Joshi