

June 9, 2026
Sl. No.46
Court No.1
s.biswas

RVW 5 of 2026
With
CAN 1 of 2026
In
WPCT 131 of 2019

Narendra Narayan Talukder
vs.
Union of India and others

Mr. Ajay Debnath
... for the review applicant/petitioner

Dictated by Sujoy Paul, C.J.

1. Mr. Ajay Debnath, learned counsel appears for the petitioner. None appears for the respondent.
2. This review petition seeks review of the judgment of this court dated 25.11.2025 passed in WPCT 136 of 2019 whereby WPCT filed by the present review petitioner was dismissed. The singular ground raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is founded on Ground III of the review petition, wherein it is averred that in the order no reference is given to search notice dated 26.08.2013 wherein it was stated in relation to a previous notice

dated 07.02.2013. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this fact needs to be incorporated in the order under review. No other point is pressed by learned counsel for the review petitioner.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner at length on the said point raised.

4. This court considered these aspects in sufficient detail and passed an oral order immediately after hearing the main matter.

In paragraph 22, this court recorded as under:

“22. The next contention of Sri Debnath was based on the Vigilance Report. He advanced an attractive argument that when in multiple replies to the R.T.I. questions, the Railway Administration maintained their stand that relevant selection files are not traceable, as to how vigilance report can gain confidence and treated to be trustworthy. We have examined the matter carefully. The Vigilance Report was prepared in the year 2013. From Vigilance Report it is clear that findings are founded upon the marshalling of the relevant files. The R.T.I. informations on which Sri Debnath has placed reliance were issued in the year 2015 and 2016. Thus, it cannot be said that when Vigilance Report was prepared in the year 2013, the files were not traceable. Thus, this R.T.I. information on which heavy reliance is placed, will not

improve the case of the present petitioners.”

5. In view of this finding, it is clear that non-mention of search notice dated 26.08.2013 will not improve the case of the present review petitioner. The same does not fall within the ambit of error apparent on the face on record. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not satisfy as to what will be the impact of non-consideration of search notice dated 26.08.2013. In view of the findings given in paragraphs 22 and 23 of the order under review, no case is made out for interference. Under the garb of review petition, a new case cannot be permitted to be made out. The review petition is dismissed.

6. In view of the dismissal of the review petition, the pending interlocutory application is dismissed.

(Sujoy Paul, C.J.)

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)