

Ct. No.4 D/L 19.03.2026
(Naba) 07

R.V.W. 117 of 2025
With
CAN 1 of 2025
Shyamali Maity
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.
in
F.M.A. 91 of 2025
Shyamali Maity
VS.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Surendra Kumar Sharma
...for the Petitioner
Mr. Suman Basu (through VC)
...for the Respondent No.8
Mr. Sudipta Panda,
Ms. Ananya Neogi
...for the State

1. The learned advocate for the review petitioner submits that the prayer for interest, was not pressed before the writ court and, therefore, a review has been filed.
2. In view of such submissions, it is the case of the review applicant that he did not press the relief for interest in the appeal, from which the review arises.
3. It would have been a different matter if there was a submission made in appeal, but not considered. That is not the case. The review jurisdiction cannot be invoked to reargue a case, or to raise issues which admittedly was not pressed at the time of hearing of the appeal, review of which is sought, in the present proceeding.
4. The Review Application is accordingly dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)