



\$~SB-1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 5600/2018

SURESH SANKHLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Tamali Wad, Sr. Adv along with
Mr. Varyam Pandey, Ms. Palak Garg,
Advs.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, SPC with
Mr. Rishabh Duggal, GP, Ms. Drishti
Rawal, Mr. Abhay Nair, Mr. Sarthak
Srivastava and Mr. Mayur Goyal,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIMAL KUMAR YADAV

ORDER

%

28.11.2025

REVIEW PET. 569/2025

1. This Review Petition has been filed by the Petitioner seeking review of the Judgment dated 10.10.2025 by which this Court had dismissed the Writ Petition filed by the Petitioner seeking quashing of the order dated 03.01.2018 passed by the Directorate General Border Security Force (BSF), Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India and the order dated 09.12.2016, passed by the Special Director General (Eastern Command) BSF.
2. This Court has heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioner in detail.
3. The Review Petitioner has not been able to point out any error apparent on the face of record. It is well settled that review petitions can be



entertained only when there is an error apparent on the face of the record and in review petitions the matter cannot be reargued.

4. The Apex Court, while dealing with the scope of interference and limitation of review in the case of Inderchand Jain (dead) Through LRs Vs. Motilal (dead) Through LRs, (2009) 14 SCC 663, has observed as under :-

“33. The High Court had rightly noticed the review jurisdiction of the court, which is as under:

“The law on the subject—exercise of power of review, as propounded by the Apex Court and various other High Courts may be summarised as hereunder:

(i) Review proceedings are not by way of appeal and have to 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 long-drawn 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.”



In our opinion, the principles of law enumerated by it, in the facts of this case, have wrongly been applied.”

5. The points taken by the learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner are only to persuade this Court to take a different view from the view already taken in the Writ Petition, which is outside the scope of the Review Petition.
6. Accordingly, the Review Petition is dismissed.

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

VIMAL KUMAR YADAV, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2025

Rahul