

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****REVIEW PETITION NO. 59 OF 2026****IN****WRIT PETITION NO. 15677 OF 2025**

Riyaz Sajjan and Anr.

...Petitioners**In the matter between.**

Mr. Riyaz Sajjan and Anr.

...Petitioners

V/s.

Jehangir Dinshaw Irani and Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Khushnood Akhtar, *Mr. Shivaji Nirmale, Mr. Hamza Shaikh and Shifa Faruqui i/b Shama Shinde for Petitioners.*

Ms. Pratibha Shelake *for Respondents.*

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**DATED: 10 APRIL 2026.****P.C.:**

1) The Petition is filed seeking review of the order dated 27 March 2026.

2) It must be observed at the very outset that this Court does not appreciate filing of Review Petition through the Advocate, who did not argue the main Petition. The practice of seeking review of orders passed by Courts by engaging another Advocate has been deprecated repeatedly by Supreme Court.

3) Leaving aside the above aspect, I otherwise do not find any valid reason to entertain the present Review Petition. Alongwith Review Petition, now a copy of Shop Act License of the year 1997 is sought to be produced. In para 16 of the order under Review, this Court specifically observed that the Petitioner had failed to produce the documents alongwith with the Petition, which were sought to be tendered before the Appellate Court alongwith Application under Order 41 Rule 27 of the Code. To fill up that lacuna, now copy of Shop Act License of 1997 is sought to be filed alongwith the Review Petition. However, in paragraph 17 of the order, this Court had noted the fact that the Petitioners were cross-examined and during such cross-examination their witness was called upon to produce Shop Act License. A specific admission was given about non-existence of any such document. Therefore, in para 17 of the order under review, this Court has taken into consideration the fact that a nonexistent document was directly sought to be produced before the Appellate Court raising serious doubt about its authenticity. Points sought to be raised are already decided. Review is sought as if it is an appeal in disguise. In my view therefore no case is made out for review of order dated 27 March 2026.

4) Review Petition is accordingly **rejected**.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]