Ct. No.4 D/L 01.04.2026
(Naba) 09

R.V.W. 31 of 2026
With
CAN 1 of 2026

Biswajit Dey
Vs.
The Secretary, Public Service Commission & Ors.

Mr. Chitta Ranjan Chakraborty,
Mr. Kashiswar Ghosal,
Ms. Puspa Rani Jaiswara
...for the Petitioner
Mr. Tapan Kumar Mukherjee, ld. A.G.P.,
Ms. Sangeeta Roy
...for the State
Ms. Piyali Sengupta,
Mr. Victor Chatterjee,
Ms. Shreya Bhattacharjee
...for the P.S.C.

1. The learned advocate for the petitioner has tried to find fault with the conclusions of the Court passed in the order dated 08.12.2025 disposing of the Writ Petition bearing No. W.P.S.T. 155 of 2024.
2. The law by now is very well settled that a review can be invoked if there is an error apparent on the face of the record which can be perceived without a long drawn argument, as is sought to be advanced on behalf of the present review petitioner.
3. There is also no case made out that there is any relevant material which was existing on the date which despite due diligence could not be placed before the Court. No analogous circumstances also point out.

4. The law is very well settled as regards the review jurisdiction which is not to be confused as an appellate proceeding. No error apparent on the face of the record is pointed out. Therefore, an attempt by the learned advocate for the writ/review petitioner to argue an appeal in the garb of a review cannot be countenanced.

5. We find resort to the review jurisdiction to be unsustainable, keeping in view the nature of arguments being advanced today.

6. Our conclusion is fortified by recent Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Sanjay Kumar Agarwal Vs. State Tax Officer (1) & Anr. reported in ***(2024) 2 SCC 362***.

7. Review application is dismissed.

8. Connected application also stands disposed of.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)