

19.02.2026
rpan/01

RVW 158 of 2025
+
IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025
Shyamapada Patra
– *Versus* –
The Union of India & Others
in
WPCT 97 of 2013

Mr. Asim Kumar Niyogi
... for the Applicant/
Writ Petitioner.

Mr. Siddhartha Bhattacharyya,
Ms. Hasi Saha
... for the UoI/
Respondent Nos.1-3.

Aggrieved by the judgment dated 6th March, 2024 passed in the writ petition, being WPCT 97 of 2013, the writ petitioner/applicant has preferred the present review application, being RVW 158 of 2025 along with an application for appropriate order, being IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025.

Mr. Niyogi, learned advocate appearing for the applicant primarily argues that the discovery of new and important documents and evidence, which could not be produced at the time of hearing of writ petition in spite of exercise of due diligence, has prompted the applicant to prefer the present review application. One such document is a memo 18th March, 2024 issued by the Headmaster, Hotar Adarsha High School. The

other two documents are memoranda dated 14th March, 2024 and 17th December, 2025 issued by the Headmaster of the Panchuakhali High School (H.S.). All the said documents certified the applicant's date of birth to be 17th November, 1984.

He further argues that the authenticity of the said documents cannot be doubted as the same had been issued upon considering the original school records. However, for belated issuance of the said documents the applicant cannot be made to suffer, moreso when he had been deprived of his source of livelihood.

Mr. Bhattacharyya, learned advocate appearing for the Union of India and its functionaries submits that it is not a case that even after exercise of due diligence, the memoranda dated 14th March, 2024, 18th March, 2024 and 17th December, 2025 could not be brought to the notice of the Court by the applicant at the time of hearing. The said documents have been procured subsequent to dismissal of the writ petition and on the basis of the said documents the entire dispute cannot be reopened. The applicant cannot reinvigorate his claim which has been finally decided up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Drawing our attention to the averments made in paragraph 7 of the reply submitted by the respondents before the learned Tribunal, he submits that the certificate issued by the Panchuakhali High School (H.S.) was also examined earlier. There is no patent error apparent on the face of the records and the parameters prescribed for review do not postulate a rehearing of the dispute because a party has not highlighted all the issues.

We have heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and considered the materials on record.

The matter which ought to have been urged in course of hearing of the main writ petition, has been sought to be agitated afresh and as such, the argument of Mr. Niyogi that the appeal needs to be reheard upon review is not acceptable to this Court.

Power of review may be exercised when some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record is found. But, error on the face of the record must be such an error which must strike on mere looking at the record and would not require any long-drawn process of reasoning.

Applying such proposition of law to the facts of the case, we are of the opinion that no

interference is called for in the present review application.

Accordingly, the review application, being RVW 158 of 2025 and the application for appropriate order, being IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025 are dismissed.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied as expeditiously as possible.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)