



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT NAGPUR

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW)
NO. 808 OF 2025

IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 391 OF 2022

SHRI AHMAD SHAH SABDAR SHAH
VERSUS
SHRI. KASIM PIRU AND OTHERS

Advocate for the Applicant : Mr. A. P. Wachasundar

CORAM : SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.
(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE)

Dated : 16th January, 2026

ORDER :-

1. The applicant seeks review of the order dated 26.09.2025 rendered by this Court in Writ Petition No. 391 of 2022.
2. Heard learned counsel for applicant.
3. Having considered the contentions put forth by the learned counsel for applicant, I have perused the order under of which review is sought.
4. It is well settled law that review petition has very limited scope and party seeking review cannot canvas the original proceeding as like the writ petition before the Court, as has been

laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Lily Thomas Vs. Union of India (AIR 2000 SC 1650)**.

5. It is further well settled position of law that the scope of review jurisdiction is limited only to correct the error of law leading to manifest injustice, as has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Telangana Vs. Mohammad Abdul Karim [(2024)6 SCC 461]**.

6. The learned counsel for petitioner has attempted to re-agitate and re-argue the ground mentioned in the writ petition. As stated hereinabove, it is trite that it is not open for party to re-agitate the grounds those are already raised and considered while deciding the original proceeding.

7. Thus, under the pretext of review, the applicant cannot be permitted to re-agitate and re-argue the questions those have already been addressed, dealt in detail and eventually decided.

8. An error on the face of record must be such an error which, mere looking at the record should strike and does not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on the points where there may conceivably be two opinions. The same is attempted by the learned counsel for applicant by filing this review application, is

impermissible in law. The applicant is unable to point out error much less error of law, apparent on the face of record.

9. In view of the afore-stated aspect, no error is noted in the order dated 26.09.2025 under review.

10. Resultantly, the review application *sans* merit and accordingly, the same stands dismissed. However, no order as to costs.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J.)

Omkar Joshi