

June 9, 2026
Sl. No.47
Court No.1
s.biswas

RVW 20 of 2026
In
WPCT 186 of 2015

Shyamal Kar
vs.
Union of India and others

Mr. Gokul Chandra Chakraborty
Mr. Aditya Shit
... for the review applicant/petitioner

Dictated by Partha Sarathi Sen, J.

1. We have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the review petitioner at length.
2. At the very outset learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner (review petitioner herein) draws attention of this court to paragraph 43 of the judgment dated 25.11.2025 as passed by this court in WPCT 186 of 2015. It is submitted that for some reason or other, this court while passing the judgment dated 25.11.2025, came to a finding that the learned arguing counsel for the writ petitioner (review petitioner herein) could not place any rule to substantiate that the

rule governing the disciplinary action against the writ petitioner/original applicant is akin to the rule as involved in the case of ***Union of India & Ors. vs. B. V. Gopinath*** reported in ***2013 LAB. I.C. 4175***.

3. At this juncture, attention of this court is drawn to paragraph 19 of the aforesaid judgment. It is submitted that in course of hearing of the WPCT 186 of 2015, it was strongly contended that the rule governing the disciplinary action of the writ petitioner (review petitioner herein) is the CCA Rules and therefore the finding of this court in paragraph 43 of the judgment dated 25.11.2025 is faulty, which resulted dismissal of the said writ petition. It is thus submitted that on account of the error apparent on the face of the record, the review petition may be admitted.
4. No other ground is raised in course of hearing by the learned counsel for the review petitioner.

5. We have meticulously gone through the review petition as well as the grounds mentioned therein. We have given our due consideration over the submissions of learned counsel for the contending parties. In paragraph 43 of the said judgment dated 25.11.2025, we have discussed the implication of the judgment as passed in the case of **B. V. Gopinath** (supra) and came to a logical finding that at the time of hearing, learned counsel on behalf of the writ petitioner (review petitioner herein) could not show any rule to substantiate that before submission of charge-sheet against the delinquent approval has to be taken from the competent authority.
6. We thus find that the argument as advanced on behalf of the review petitioner in the instant review petition, is devoid of any merit, especially when learned counsel appearing on behalf of the review petitioner could not substantiate any of the grounds for considering the review petition favourably as enshrined in the

provision of Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure and/or the principles analogous therein.

7. In view of the discussion made hereinabove, we find no reason to entertain the instant review petition.

8. The review petition is thus dismissed.

(Sujoy Paul, C.J.)

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)