HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE NO.: W.A.No.1097 OF 2025

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
09.	09.02.2026	**MB,J & GPK,J** Mr. Mayur Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. K. Koushik, learned counsel appearing for the appellant. Mr. Rajinikanth Reddy Tera, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondent Nos.1 to 3. **Review I.A.No.2 of 2026** **In** **W.A.No.1097 of 2025** Heard Sri B.Mayur Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Koushik Kanduri, learned counsel for the review applicant/ applicant and Sri Tera Rajinikanth Reddy, the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State/respondent Nos. 1 to 3. The present Review Application is filed under Order XLVII Rule 1 read with Section 114 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking review of the judgment dated 08.12.2025, passed by this Court in W.A.No.1097 of 2025. By the judgment dated 08.12.2025, the Writ Appeal, filed by the review applicant/ appellant, was dismissed, affirming the order dated 01.05.2025, passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.4717 of 2024, whereby the learned Single Judge rejected the review applicant/appellant's claim for Category-A classification under G.O.Ms.No.19 dated 29.08.2023 and directed the respondents to convert the subject land of the review applicant under Category-B by collecting 200% of the registration value as on the date of registration	(PTO)

including any other charges in accordance with the guidelines of the Registration Department.

The grounds raised in the review petition are that non-consideration of the contention by the Court in the Writ Appeal that the impugned order was passed on the strength of a Non-speaking notice dated 25.10.2022 without affording the appellant an opportunity of hearing. It is further pleaded that the there is a clear error in relying upon an inspection report of the year 2022 to conclude that no industrial activity was carried out at the appellant's site, when neither the notice dated 25.10.2022 nor the subsequent notice dated 14.08.2023 contained any allegation based on such inspection report, insofar as the appellant is concerned. Apart from raising other grounds stating that those grounds were not taken note of by this Court while passing the judgment in the Writ Appeal, this Review Application is filed.

The review applicant contends that the findings of the Joint Inspection Report were not furnished to the review applicant and that the review applicant was not served with any notice.

In support of his contentions, the learned counsel for the review applicant/appellant relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajender Singh v/s. Lt. Governor, Andaman & Nicobar Islands*** ((2005) 13 SCC 289), wherein it was held that the High Court was not justified in ignoring the material on record, which on proper consideration, may justify the claim of the appellant. Further, the Supreme Court considered the grievance of the appellant therein, namely, that although several vital

(PTO)

		issues were raised and documents were placed on record, the High Court has not considered the same while exercising its review jurisdiction, and accordingly held that the High Court's order in the review petition was not correct and warranted interference. However, the facts in the above decision are different from the facts of the present case. On the other hand, the learned Additional Advocate General contended that subsequent notices dated 25.10.2022 and 14.08.2023, which specifically refer to the Joint Inspection Report, were served on the review applicant and that the review applicant did not object to such notices, which ultimately led to passing of the judgment under Review dated 08.12.2025. As per Order XLVII Rule 1 of the CPC, the power of review can be exercised for the correction of a mistake, which is apparent on the face of the record, but not to substitute the view taken earlier. A Court will not sit in review of its own order since rehearing of the case under the guise of review is not permissible. Hence, the power of review is invoked only to prevent a miscarriage of justice or to correct grave and palpable errors. In the light of the above, it is to be noted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Northern India Caterers (India) Limited v/s. State (UT of Delhi)*** [(1980) 2 SCC 167], had observed that review proceeding cannot be equated with original hearing of the case. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sanjay Kumar Agarwal v/s. State Tax Officer (1) and another*** [(2024) 2 SCC 362] had laid	*(PTO)*

down the scope of the Review as under:

"(i) A judgment is open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record.

(ii) A judgment pronounced by the court is final, and departure from that principle is justified only when circumstances of a substantial and compelling character make it necessary to do so.

(iii) An error which is not self-evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of record justifying the court to exercise its power of review.

(iv) In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1CPC, it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be "reheard and corrected".

(v) A review petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be "an appeal in disguise".

(vi) Under the guise of review, the petitioner cannot be permitted to reagitate and reargue the questions which have already been addressed and decided.

(vii) An error on the face of record must be such an error which, mere looking at the record should strike and it should not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on the points where there may conceivably be two opinions.

(viii) Even the change in law or subsequent decision/judgment of a coordinate or larger Bench by itself cannot be regarded as a ground for review."

The judgment dated 08.12.2025, review of which is sought for, does not fall in any of the aforesaid categories laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

For the foregoing reasons, the order dated 08.12.2025 passed in W.A.No.1097 of 2025 neither suffers from any infirmity nor any error apparent on the face of record warranting review of the said order.

Review I.A.No.2 of 2026 is accordingly dismissed.

I.A.No.1 of 2026
in
Review I.A.No.2 of 2026

In view of dismissal of Review I.A.No.2 of 2026, I.A.No.1 of 2026 is also dismissed.

MB,J

GPK,J

Va/gj