



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
 AT CHANDIGARH**

(104) CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024
 Date of Decision : November 21, 2025

**Union of India through its Secretary to Government of India and others
 .. Petitioners**

Versus

Ex. NK Rajender and another .. Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
 HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. S. K. Sharma, Senior Panel Counsel,
 for the applicant petitioners- UOI.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

CM-14076-CWP-2025

The prayer in the present application is for condonation of
 delay of 258 days in filing the review application i.e. **RA-CW-419-2025**.

Keeping in view the averments enumerated in the application,
 which are duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed.
 Consequently, the delay of 258 days in filing the review application i.e. **RA-
 CW-419-2025** is condoned.

CM-14077-CWP-2025

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

Annexure A-2 is taken on record.



**CM-14076-CWP-2025;
CM-14077-CWP-2025;
CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
RA-CW-419-2025 in
CWP-28654-2024** 2

CM-14078-CWP-2025

As prayed for, the application is allowed.

RA-CW-419-2025 (O&M)

1. In the present review application, the prayer of the review applicant is for reviewing the order dated 27.11.2024 passed by the Division Bench of this Court, on the ground that the interpretation of Regulation 179 of the Pension Regulations for Army, 1961 is not correct and the same is contrary to the interpretation given by the other Courts.

2. We have heard learned senior panel counsel for the review applicant-petitioners and have gone through the case file with his able assistance.

3. The argument being raised by the learned counsel for the review applicant-petitioners is that the interpretation given by the Court is incorrect.

4. As per the settled principle of law, the jurisdiction to review an order is very limited and same is only permissible, in case, any incorrect facts has been recorded so as to arrive at a conclusion. Further, the review is only permissible, in case, any fact which was not to the knowledge of the review applicant despite due diligence, have come to the notice of such review applicant so as to press the same into review so as to recall the order.

5. In the present case, the review of the order dated 27.11.2024 is being sought on the ground that the conclusion arrived at by the Court keeping in view the facts and circumstances which were brought on record



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024

3

is not correct. The said ground is not permissible in the review application, as the ground of incorrect order can only be agitated in an appeal. Hence, no review can be filed under the guise of an appeal so as to re-argue the case so as to convince the Bench hearing the review application to arrive at a different conclusion.

6. As per settled principle of law, under the garb of review petition, the review-applicant-petitioners cannot be allowed to re-argue the case as the review Court cannot sit in appeal over its own decision. Reliance can be placed upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Civil Appeal Nos.1167-1170 of 2023 titled as S. Murali Sundaram vs.Jothibai Kannan and others decided on 24.02.2023.*** Relevant paragraph of the said judgment is as under:-

5.1 While considering the aforesaid issue two decisions of this Court on Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 114 CPC are required to be referred to? In the case of Perry Kansagra (supra) this Court has observed that while exercising the review jurisdiction in an application under Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 114 CPC, the Review Court does not sit in appeal over its own order. It is observed that a rehearing of the matter is impermissible in law. It is further observed that review is not appeal in disguise. It is observed that power of review can be exercised for correction of a mistake but not to substitute a view. Such powers can be exercised within the limits of the statute dealing with the exercise of power. It is further observed that it is wholly unjustified and exhibits a tendency to rewrite a judgment by which the controversy has been finally decided. After considering catena of decisions on exercise of review powers and principles relating to exercise of review jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC this Court had summed upon as under:-“

(i) Review proceedings are not by way of appeal and have to



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024

4

be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of [Order 47 Rule 1 CPC](#).

(ii) Power of review may be exercised when some mistake or error apparent on the fact of record is found. But error on the face of record must be such an error which must strike one on mere looking at the record and would not require any longdrawn process of reasoning on the points where there may conceivably be two opinions.

(iii) Power of review may not be exercised on the ground that the decision was erroneous on merits.

(iv) Power of review can also be exercised for any sufficient reason which is wide enough to include a misconception of fact or law by a court or even an advocate.

(v) An application for review may be necessitated by way of invoking the doctrine actus curiae neminem gravabit.”

7. Further, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in ***Aribam Tuleshwar Sharma vs. Aribam Prishak Sharma, (1979) 4 SCC 389*** has been held that it is only on discovery of new and important matter which after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking the review or could not be produced by him at the time when order was made, the remedy of review may be exercised however, a review petition cannot be filed on the ground that decision was erroneous on merits as the same will be province of a Court of appeal. Relevant paragraph of the judgment is as under:-

3. The Judicial Commissioner gave two reasons for reviewing his predecessor's order. The first was that his predecessor had overlooked two important documents Exs. A-1 and A-3 which showed that the respondents were in possession of the sites even in the year 1948-49 and that the grants must have been made even by then. The second was that there was a patent illegality in permitting the appellant to question, in a single writ petition, settlement made in favour of different respondents. We are afraid that neither of the reasons mentioned by the learned Judicial Commissioner constitutes



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024

5

a ground for review. It is true as observed by this Court in [Shivdeo Singh v.State of Punjab](#) [AIR 1963 SC 1909] there is nothing in [Article 226](#) of the Constitution to preclude a High Court from exercising the power of review which inheres in every court of plenary jurisdiction to prevent miscarriage of justice or to correct grave and palpable errors committed by it. But, there are definitive limits to the exercise of the power of review. The power of review may be exercised on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the person seeking the review or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made; it may be exercised where some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found; it may also be exercised on any analogous ground. But, it may not be exercised on the ground that the decision was erroneous on merits. That would be the province of a court of appeal. A power of review is not to be confused with appellate powers which may enable an appellate court to correct all manner of errors committed by the subordinate court."

8. While deciding the same issue of review, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Parison Devi vs. Sumitri Devi (1997) 8 SCC 715*** held that 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 the record justifying the exercise of power of review. Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that review petition cannot be filed for an erroneous decision to be reheard and corrected and the said review petition cannot be an appeal in disguise. Relevant paragraph of the judgment is as under:-

9. Under [Order 47 Rule 1 CPC](#) a judgment may be open to review *inter alia* if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. 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 the record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under [Order 47 Rule 1 CPC](#). In exercise of the jurisdiction under [Order 47 Rule 1 CPC](#) it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be "reheard and corrected". A review petition, it must be remembered has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
 CM-14077-CWP-2025;
 CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
 RA-CW-419-2025 in
 CWP-28654-2024

6

be "an appeal in disguise".

9. The said decision has already been followed by this Court in

Paramjit Singh through LR's vs. Gurdial Singh and others, 2022 SCC

Online P&H 1637. Relevant paragraph of the judgment is as under:-

"The counsel has further in his arguments sought to raise the points of self-contradictions self contradictions and self selfdefeating stands and which could not be taken into consideration in a review application and and it is well settled law as has sought to be relied upon by counsel for the respondent who has cited the judgments titled as 'Sasi (D) Through LR's. v. Aravindakshan Nair' (2017) 2 RCR (Civil) 363 and 'Parsion Devi v. Sumitri Devi' (1997) 4 RCR (Civil) 458 458;; where the Apex Court has laid down that a review cannot be allowed to be disguised as an appeal for getting an erroneous decision reheard and corrected and has to be used within the ambit of [Order 47 Rule 1 CPC](#) to rectify any error patent on the records instead of assailing the orders on the appeals by this Court before the next Court the instant review has come about for a motivated cause. Since, this Court cannot come across any mistake or an error apparent on the records which could be self evident and any such interpretation that is sought to be put forth by the counsel for the applicant by process of reasoning cannot be considered at this juncture."

10. Recently Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Shri Ram Sahu***

(Dead) through Legal Representatives and others vs. Vinod Kumar Rawat

and others (2021) 13 SCC 1, held as under:-

"6. The limitations on exercise of the power of review are well settled. The first and foremost require requirement of entertaining a review petition is that the order, review of which is sought, suffers from any error apparent on the face of the order and permitting the order to stand will lead to failure of justice. In the absence of any such error, finality attached to the judgment/order cannot be disturbed."

9. The power of review can also be exercised by the court in the event is recovery of new and important matter or evidence takes place which despite exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made. An application for review would also lie if the order has been passed on account of some mistake. Furthermore, an application for review shall also lie for any other sufficient reason."



**CM-14076-CWP-2025;
CM-14077-CWP-2025;
CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
RA-CW-419-2025 in
CWP-28654-2024**

7

10. It is beyond any doubt or dispute that the review court does not sit in appeal over its own order. A rehearing of the matter is impermissible in law. It constitutes an exception to the general rule that once a judgment is signed or pronounced, it should not be altered. It is also trite that pronounced, exercise of inherent jurisdiction is not invoked for reviewing any order.

11. Review is not appeal in disguise. In *Lily Thomas v. Union of India* [*Lily Thomas v. Union of India*, (2000) 6 SCC 224 :2000 SCC (Cri) 1056] this Court held : (SCC p. 251, para 56) '56. It follows, therefore, that the power of review can be exercised for correction of a mistake but not to substitute a view. Such powers can be exercised within the limits of the statute dealing with the exercise of power. The review cannot be treated like an appeal in disguise.' "

8. The dictionary meaning of the word "review" is "the act of looking, offer something again with a view to correction or improvement". It cannot be denied that the review is the creation of a statute. In *v. Pradyumansinghji Arjunsinghji*, (1971) 3 SCC 844] , this Court has held that the power of review is not an inherent power. It must be conferred by law either specifically or by necessary implication. The review is also not an appeal in disguise. [Patel Narshi Thakershi v. Pradyumansinghji Arjunsinghji](#) [[Patel Narshi Thakershi](#)].

9. What can be said to be an error apparent on the face of the proceedings has been dealt with and considered by this Court in *v. T. Nagappa*, AIR 1954 SC 440] . It is held that such an error is an error

which is a patent error and not a mere wrong decision in [T.C. Basappa v. T. Nagappa](#) [[T.C. Basappa](#)on. In [Hari Vishnu Kamath v. Syed Ahmad Ishaque](#) [[Hari Vishnu Kamath](#) v. Syed Ahmad Ishaque, (1955) 1 SCR 110 11044 : AIR 1955 SC [233] , it is observed as under : (SCC p. 244, para 23)."

11. Keeping in view the settled principles of law noticed hereinbefore, the review application which has been filed by the applicant-petitioners is only to re-argue the case so as to contend that the findings recorded by the Court is not correct, hence the review petition is not maintainable and is liable to be rejected.

12. Keeping in view the above, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.



CM-14076-CWP-2025;
CM-14077-CWP-2025;
CM-14078-CWP-2025; in/and
RA-CW-419-2025 in
CWP-28654-2024 8

- 13. Present review application is dismissed.
- 14. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

November 21, 2025
harsha

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No