

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE NO: WRIT APPEAL NOS.1318 AND 1320 OF 2024
PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
07.	03.04.2025	<u>HACJ (SP,J) & RY,J</u> <u>REVIEW I.A.No.2 of 2025 and I.A.No.3 of 2025</u> <u>in W.A.No.1318 of 2024</u> <u>And</u> <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025 and REVIEW I.A.No.3 of 2025</u> <u>in W.A.No.1320 of 2024</u> Sri Sadu Rajeswara Reddy, learned counsel for the review petitioners/appellants. Heard on these interlocutory applications. Learned counsel for the review petitioners submits that he has filed some new material before this Court in review jurisdiction and submits that in view of these documents, the writ appellate Court should have interfered with the matter. In paragraph No.9 of I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.1318 of 2024, the review petitioner pleaded as under: “9. I respectfully submit that the Hon’ble Division Bench ought to have remanded back the WP No.38638/2018 to the learned single judge for reconsideration basing on the new material available in the appellate stage before this Hon’ble Division Bench even in giving an opportunity to the petitioner/appellant to file amendment petition before the learned single judge and to give an opportunity to both the parties and to decide the matter on merits within a	Transferred to IO Folder before corrections.

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		stipulated period of two months because the matter was spending for long time.” The scope of review jurisdiction is limited. The principles analogous to Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), are applicable even for exercising review jurisdiction by the writ/writ appellate Court. On more than one occasion, a specific query was raised by this Court whether the new material on which the learned counsel for the review petitioners is placing reliance can be looked into in view of the language employed in Order XLVII Rule 1 of CPC. The learned counsel for the review petitioners has not pleaded that those documents were not within his knowledge when the writ appeal was heard. It is also not pleaded that despite due diligence, the said documents could not be traced and filed. Thus, minimum essential ingredients for making out a case of review are not made out. Learned counsel for the review petitioners submits that technically the order of the writ Court may be correct, but the matter may be remanded back to the writ Court so that the review petitioners can amend their petitions and contest the matter properly.	

SL. NO	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		In our opinion, this cannot be a ground to exercise the review jurisdiction. No error apparent on the face of the record could be pointed out. Accordingly, these interlocutory applications are dismissed. HACJ (SP,J) RY,J sa/vs	