IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT TELANGANA

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA

REVIEW I.A. No.2 of 2025

in

W.P. No. 1033 of 2016

24th February, 2026

Between:

Nunavath Veeranna S/o Sankar

… Petitioner

AND

1. Telangana State Power Generation Corporation Ltd., and others

… Respondents

ORDER:

This review application is filed by petitioner No. 6 in W.P. No. 1033 of 2016, seeking review of the Order dated 23.06.2025 passed by this Court in the said writ petition, on the ground that petitioner No. 6 was initially appointed on a contractual basis and was subsequently absorbed as Artisan, subject to the result of W.P. No. 149 of 2017, vide Memo dated 29.07.2017. Thereafter, the respondents suspended the absorption order of the petitioner by Order dated 29.08.2017, continuing petitioner No. 6 on a contractual "as is where is" basis as Artisan Grade–I, whereas petitioner No. 6 claims that, being a land loser, he is entitled to appointment as Junior Plant Attendant in respondent–Kothagudem Thermal Power Station under the land loser quota.

1.1 It is also urged that the respondent authorities initially appointed the unofficial respondents as "Mazdoors," and later appointed them as "Junior Plant Attendants" vide Memo dated 14.09.2017. It is further submitted that this Court, in the Order under review, observed that no acknowledgment was filed with regard to the representation dated 07.12.2015. According to the review petitioner, though he had such acknowledgment, it was misplaced and was traced only after a diligent search. Hence, he prays that this Court may consider the acknowledgment and representation dated 07.12.2015 and direct the respondent authorities to appoint him as "Junior Plant Attendant" under the land losers' quota.

2. Heard Mr. G. Allabakash, learned counsel for the review petitioner, and Mr. Srinivas Srikanth, learned Standing Counsel for TS GENCO, appearing for the respondents. Perused the record.

3. At the outset, it is relevant to note that in the writ petition, petitioner No. 1 (Kodi Venkatesh) filed the writ affidavit as well as the Reply Affidavit on his own behalf and on behalf of the other petitioners, including petitioner No. 6 (the review petitioner herein). It is specifically averred, inter alia, in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Reply Affidavit dated 27.01.2025 as follows:

> **"10. … As per G.O.Ms. No. 98 dated 15.04.1986, the petitioners are entitled to be provided employment as Junior Assistant or in an equivalent category in TG GENCO. I submit that I and petitioners No. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 worked on a contract basis and, as per the scheme, were absorbed, but not under the land losers' quota. Under the land losers' quota, we are entitled to Junior Assistant/JPA posts, and as on today, the above said posts have been given as per G.O.Ms. No. 98. I submit that the 2nd petitioner is not interested in pursuing his claim under the land losers' quota; however, his brother is claiming employment and has filed W.P. No. 8746 of 2021 seeking a direction to TG GENCO to provide employment to him**

under the land losers' quota. Hence, the 2nd petitioner is withdrawing his claim under the land losers' quota.

11. …. I submit that I and petitioners No. 2 to 4, 6, 7, and 8 were engaged on a contract basis and, as per the scheme, have been absorbed as Artisans. I submit that as per the ranking given, petitioners 1 to 4, 6, 7, and 8 were absorbed, whereas petitioners 5 and 9 in the writ petition were never provided employment either on a contract basis or on a regular basis."

4. It was also observed in the writ proceedings that though certain representations were annexed at page Nos. 32 to 52 of the material papers, they did not contain any acknowledgment of receipt to establish that they were submitted before the 5th respondent. In view of the pleadings and the Memo dated 23.06.2025, the learned counsel pressed only for consideration of petitioner No. 9 for employment as per the acknowledged representation dated 07.12.2015.

5. Admittedly, the review petitioner was engaged on a contract basis and was subsequently absorbed as an "Artisan" under the scheme. Having availed such absorption, though under a scheme distinct from the land losers' quota, he cannot now re-agitate the claim for appointment under another quota, as the relief stood satisfied in his case.

6. It is to be noted that the representations seeking employment under G.O.Ms. No. 98 dated 15.04.1986 were made on 07.12.2015. As recorded in the Order dated 23.06.2025, no acknowledgments were filed, except in the case of petitioner No. 9. The review petitioner now states that he had misplaced the acknowledgment and traced it after considerable search, and therefore seeks consideration of his representation, contending that delay and laches should not defeat socio-economic benefits. However, the acknowledgment now produced bears the date 07.12.2014, whereas the

representation is dated 07.12.2015, which casts serious doubt on its authenticity.Though delay on the part of authorities or displaced persons, for reasons beyond their control, cannot defeat the object of a beneficial scheme, the facts of the present case do not justify such indulgence. The writ petition was filed in 2016 and disposed of on 23.06.2025. The review petitioner, who was absorbed as an Artisan, did not assert this plea earlier, and his counsel pressed relief only in respect of petitioner No. 9. After more than a decade from the date of representation and a year after disposal of the writ petition, the plea of misplaced acknowledgmentcannot be accepted.

7. At this juncture, it is relevant to note that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down the ambit and scope of a Review Petition under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC in **Kamlesh Verma v. Mayawati**[1], which are as follows:

> **19. Review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In review jurisdiction, mere disagreement with the view of the judgment cannot be the ground for invoking the same. As long as the point is already dealt with and answered, the parties are not entitled to challenge the impugned judgment in the guise that an alternative view is possible under the review jurisdiction.**
>
> **SUMMARY OF THE PRINCIPLES**
>
> **20. Thus, in view of the above, the following grounds of review are maintainable as stipulated by the statute:**
>
> **20.1 When the review will be maintainable:**
>
> **(i) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him;**

[1] (2013) 8 SCC 320

(ii) Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record;

(iii) Any other sufficient reason

The words "any other sufficient reason" have been interpreted in Chhajju Ram v. Neki and approved by this Court in Moran Mar Basselios Catholicos v. Most Rev. Mar Poulose Athanasius to mean "a reason sufficient on grounds at lease analogous to those specified in the rule" The same principles have been reiterated in Union of India v. Sandur Manganese & Iron Ores Ltd.

20.2 When the review will not be maintainable:

(i) A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications.

(ii) Minor mistakes of inconsequential import.

(iii) Review proceedings cannot be equated with the original hearing of the case.

(iv) Review is not maintainable unless the material error, manifest on the face of the order, undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice.

(v) A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected but lies only for patent error.

(vi) The mere possibility of two views on the subject cannot be a ground for review.

(vii) The error apparent on the face of the record should not be an error which has to be fished out and searched.

(viii) the appreciation of evidence on record is fully within the domain of the appellate court, it cannot be permitted to be advanced in the review petition.

(ix) Review is not maintainable when the same relief sought at the time of arguing the main matter had been negatived.

8. The scope of a review petition is very limited. This Court had observed that the representations were not acknowledged and, after hearing the parties, directed consideration only of writ petitioner No. 9 in accordance with law.

9. In light of the law laid down in Kamlesh Verma (supra), it cannot be said that the acknowledgment now sought to be produced was not within the knowledge of the petitioner or that it could not have been produced despite the exercise of due diligence. As noted above, the acknowledgment is dated one year prior to the actual date of the representation, which itself makes it highly doubtful. A review petition cannot be used to introduce fresh material or to reappreciate evidence as though it were an appeal.

10. In that view of the matter, there is no error apparent on the face of the record, nor does the review petition satisfy the parameters laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kamlesh Verma (supra). Therefore, no grounds are made out to review the Order dated 23.06.2025 passed in the writ petition.

11. Accordingly, the review application is dismissed. No costs. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

_____

JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA

24th February, 2026

ksm

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA

REVIEW I.A. No.2 of 2025

in

W.P. No. 1033 of 2016

24th February, 2026

ksm