CGHC010387112026 2026:CGHC:46147

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 397 of 2026

Anil Lahre S/o Shri Hiraram Lahre, Aged About 30 Years R/o Old D.R.D.A Building, Collector Complex, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) (Presently Posted As Block Social Auditor, Jila Panchayat Mahasamund, District Mahasmund (C.G.))

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchayat And Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Chhattisgarh Social Audit Unit DRDA Building M Collector Complex, Raipur, (C.G.)

3 - Collector, Raipur, Collectorate, Kutchery Chowk, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

(Cause title taken from CIS)

For Petitioner(s)	**:** Shri Roop Ram Naik, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	**:** Shri Ghanshyam Kashyap, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

02.11.2026

1. The present review petition seeks review/recall of the order dated 17.07.2026 passed in W.P.(S) No.10047 of 2025, whereby the writ petition was dismissed on the ground of availability of an alternative statutory remedy under Section 40 of the Chhattisgarh Societies Registration Act, 1973.

2. (a) Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order under review suffers from an error apparent on the face of the record, as this Court failed to consider Clause 13 of the agreement dated 30.09.2016, which confers jurisdiction upon the High Court in respect of disputes arising out of the agreement. The said agreement was itself produced by the respondents as Annexure R/2. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner, initially engaged as Block Social Audit Facilitator on 01.06.2015, was subsequently engaged as District Social Audit Facilitator with effect from 01.10.2016 and continued for nearly nine years. Despite approval for continuation during 2025-26, his name was omitted from the renewal roster, and vide order dated 11.08.2025, he was

reverted to the post of Block Social Audit Facilitator, reducing his remuneration from Rs.24,000/- to Rs.9,500/- per month.

(b) Learned counsel contends that the aforesaid reversion was punitive in nature and was effected without issuance of any show-cause notice, departmental inquiry or opportunity of hearing, thereby violating the principles of natural justice. It is further submitted that the remedy under Section 40 of the Act of 1973 is neither efficacious nor appropriate to examine the legality of decisions taken by the State Government authorities. It is further contended that the respondents, having relied upon the agreement containing Clause 13, cannot disregard its terms while raising the objection of availability of an alternative statutory remedy. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioner had preferred Writ Appeal No.872 of 2026, which was permitted to be withdrawn by the Division Bench vide order dated 18.09.2026, with liberty to avail the remedy granted by the learned Single Judge. Accordingly, the petitioner has preferred the present review petition.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the review petitioner and perused the order under review.

4. Bare perusal of the order under review reveals that the same was passed after considering the facts and grounds raised by the parties and hearing their respective counsel. The review petitioner has failed to point out any manifest error apparent on the face of the record warranting review.

5. It is well settled that the scope of review jurisdiction is narrow and confined to correcting errors apparent on the face of the record or where a relevant statutory provision has been overlooked. A patent error alone can be corrected in review; an error requiring detailed reasoning or rehearing of the matter cannot be a ground for review. This Court, in exercise of review jurisdiction, cannot sit in appeal over its own order.

6. In the present case, the grounds raised by the review petitioner essentially seek reconsideration of the issues already raised and argued in W.P.(S) No.10047 of 2025 by Shri Shutubdi Bagchi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. The order under review was passed in the presence of the learned counsel after hearing the parties at length. In the present review petition, Shri Roop Ram Naik, learned counsel, has appeared on behalf of the review petitioner. However, no satisfactory explanation has been offered for the

change in representation. In any event, the petitioner has failed to establish any manifest error apparent on the face of the record.

7. It is also relevant to note that the petitioner had preferred Writ Appeal No.872 of 2026 against the order under review, which was withdrawn vide order dated 18.09.2026 with liberty to avail the liberty granted by the learned Single Judge. Such withdrawal, without adjudication on merits, neither creates an additional ground for review nor enlarges the limited scope of review jurisdiction.

8. It is well settled that scope of review jurisdiction is extremely limited and only an error apparent on face of record can be corrected in the said jurisdiction and re-appraisal/re-appreciation cannot be done in exercise of said jurisdiction as that would amount to exercise of appellate jurisdiction which is impermissible in law as has been held in catena of judgments by the Hon'ble Apex Court, such as **Devaraju Pillai v. Sellayya Pillai**, reported in **(1987) 1 SCC 61, Meera Bhanja (Smt) v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury (Smt)**, reported in **(1995) 1 SCC 170, Avijit Tea Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. Terai Tea Co. and others,** reported in **(1996) 10 SCC 174, Lily Thomas etc. v.**

Union of India and others, reported in **AIR 2000 SC 1650, Akhilesh Yavad v. Vishwanath Chaturvedi and others**, reported in **(2013) 2 SCC 1 and Sasi (D) through LRS. v. Aravindakshan Nair and others**, reported in **(2017) 4 SCC 692)**.

9. The ground raised by the review petitioner in this review petition cannot be permitted to be raised in review petition. Even otherwise, there is no error apparent on the face of record in the order under review warranting invocation of review jurisdiction.

10. As an upshot, the review petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Bibhu Datta Guru)
Judge

Shoaib