



**CM-14809-CWP-2025 in/and
RA-CW-441-2025 (O&M) 1**

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

101

**CM-14809-CWP-2025 in/and
RA-CW-441-2025 in
CWP-17227-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 28.11.2025**

Rejender Kumar

Versus

... Applicant

Union of India and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

PRESENT: Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate for the review applicant.

Mr. Vibhor Bansal, Advocate for respondents No. 1 & 2.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

CM-14809-CWP-2025

The prayer in the present application is for condonation of delay of 59 days in filing the present review application i.e. **RA-CW-441-2025**.

Keeping in view the averments enumerated in the application, which are duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Consequently, the delay of 59 days in filing the present review application i.e. **RA-CW-441-2025**.

RA-CW-441-2025

1. In the present review applications, the prayer of the review applicant is for reviewing the order dated 01.07.2025 passed by the learned single Bench of this Court, by which, the civil writ petition No. 17227 of 2025 filed by the review applicant was disposed of with liberty to review applicant/petitioner to avail appropriate remedy before the



**CM-14809-CWP-2025 in/and
RA-CW-441-2025 (O&M) 2**

Information Commission.

2. Learned counsel for the review applicant argues that the OMR sheet which was supplied to him was not his sheet and therefore, the said OMR sheet given to the review applicant, was incorrect.

3. Keeping in view the advance copy given, learned counsel for the respondents appears and submits that it is incorrect fact on the part of the review applicant to say that the OMR sheet which was given to the petitioner was not his sheet.

4. Learned counsel respondents submits that as per the record also, the OMR sheet which belongs to the petitioner, has been supplied to him

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the case file with their able assistance.

6. The learned counsel for the review applicant is trying to dispute the fact with regard to the OMR sheet which has been supplied to review applicant. It is contended that the said OMR sheet which was given to the review applicant did not belong to the review applicant whereas, on the other hand respondents are on record to say that the OMR sheet supplied under Right to Information Act, belongs to the review applicant/petitioner, and the same has rightly been supplied to him.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances mentioned here-in-before, contradictory stand has come before this Court. Once disputed question of facts have been raised, this Court will have no jurisdiction to decide the same in view of settled principle of law settled



**CM-14809-CWP-2025 in/and
RA-CW-441-2025 (O&M) 3**

by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 2848 of 2021 titled as **Shubhas Jain Vs. Rajeshwari Shivam and others**, decided on 20.07.2021. The relevant paragraph 26 of the said judgment is as under :-

“26. It is well settled that the High Court exercising its extraordinary writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, does not adjudicate hotly disputed questions of facts. It is not for the High Court to make a comparative assessment of conflicting technical reports and decide which one is acceptable.”

8. Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances and as no incorrect fact in the order dated 01.07.2025 has been brought to the notice of this Court, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Present review application is dismissed.

10. Pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, stands disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

28.11.2025
Riya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~
Whether Reportable: Yes/~~No~~