



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

107

CM-3225-CWP-2026 and
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

Date of decision : 10.03.2026

Parvinder Singh and others

.....Applicants/Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present: Mr. Arshnoor Singh Chugh, Advocate
for the review applicants/petitioners.

Mr. Surya Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The review application bearing No.RA-CW-113-2026 has been filed on behalf of review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12, 13 & 14 (out of total 27 petitioners) under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Order 47 Rule 1 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for reviewing the order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure A-1), whereby the bunch of petitions, including the present one i.e. CWP-25785-2013, were disposed of by this Court by passing the following order :-

“xx xx xx xx xx

2. *A writ of certiorari seeking quashing of the order dated 18.08.2023 (Annexures P-13 and P-14) has been prayed for whereby regularisation orders of the petitioners have been cancelled and they have been reverted to the previous status of contractual employees after they have served as regular employees. Further prayer for quashing*



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

2

the order dated 13.07.2023 (Annexure P-10) has been made, whereby respondent No.1 has taken a decision that regularisation of the petitioners be cancelled and their previous status as contractual employees be restored on the basis of reports submitted by an Inquiry Committee.

3. *The action of the respondents has been challenged by the petitioners inter alia on the grounds that the impugned orders have been passed after five years when the services of the petitioners were regularized and the action of the respondents is in violation of the principles of natural justice as the decision was taken by the respondent-State first and then the show cause notices were issued to the petitioners for de-regularization.*

4. *While issuing notice of motion, the operation of the impugned orders was stayed and direction was issued to the respondents that petitioners shall be allowed to continue to draw regular salary.*

5. *During the course of hearing, learned State counsel, on instructions from Mr. Uma Shankar Gupta, Director and Ms. Ramanpreet Kaur, Legal Assistant, Department of Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab, submits that impugned orders in the above said cases shall be treated as withdrawn and the respondent-State shall reconsidered the matter and pass fresh orders after following the due procedure of law and by affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the aggrieved employees.*

6. *In view of the above statement made by learned State counsel, the present petitions are disposed of accordingly. However, if the intended order to be passed by the respondents will be against the petitioners, they shall be at liberty to challenge the same in accordance with law, however, the said order shall not be given effect to by the*



**CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013**

3

respondents for a period of 15 days from the date of communication of the same to the aggrieved employees.

7. All miscellaneous application(s) shall also disposed of.”

2. Learned counsel for the review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12, 13 & 14 submits that the case of the review applicants/petitioners was wrongly tagged with the other petitions which were disposed of vide order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure A-1) passed by this Court. He further submits that though the services of review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12 & 13 were regularized in the year 2020, however, they are entitled to be regularized from an earlier date. He further submits that services of review applicant/petitioner No.14 has not been regularized.

3. On receipt of advance copy of the review application, learned State counsel has put in appearance and submits that the facts which have been pleaded in the review application were not part of the pleadings in the main writ petition. He further submits that the review application has not been filed by the same counsel who represented these review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12, 13 & 14 in the main writ petition.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Admittedly, the main writ petition was filed on behalf of 27 petitioners, including the present review applicants and since 29.10.2024, the said writ petition was clubbed with other connected writ petitions, which were finally disposed of by this Hon'ble Court vide order



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

4

dated 08.12.2025. It is pertinent to mention here that facts pleaded in the instant review application were not part of the pleadings in the main writ petition and, therefore, no error apparent on the face of the record is made out. While examining the scope of review in its judgment passed in ***Sanjay Kumar Aggarwal Vs State Tax Officer & another and connected matters : (2024) 2 SCC 362***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:-

- “xx xx xx xx xx
16. *The gist of the afore-stated decisions is that: -*
- (i) *A judgment is open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record.*
- (ii) *A judgment pronounced by the Court is final, and departure from that principle is justified only when circumstances of a substantial and compelling character make it necessary to do so.*
- (iii) *An error which is not self-evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of record justifying the court to exercise its power of review.*
- (iv) *In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be “reheard and corrected.”*
- (v) *A Review Petition has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be “an appeal in disguise.”*
- (vi) *Under the guise of review, the petitioner cannot be permitted to reagitate and reargue the questions which have already been addressed and decided.*
- (vii) *An error on the face of record must be such an error which, mere looking at the record should strike and it should not require any long-drawn process of reasoning on the points where there may conceivably be two opinions.*



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

5

(viii) *Even the change in law or subsequent decision/judgment of a co-ordinate or larger Bench by itself cannot be regarded as a ground for review.*

xx xx xx xx xx”

6. To the same effect are the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Tamilnadu Terminated Full Time Temporary LIC Employees Association Vs. S.K. Roy, The Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India and another : 2016 (4) SCT 288*** and ***The State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamal Sengupta and another : 2008 (8) SCC 612***.

7. By filing the present review application review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12, 13 & 14 are wanting to re-argue and reagitate the matter, which cannot be permitted in law. The order sought to be reviewed is a consented order passed after the assertions made by the respective counsels and hence no ground is made out to entertain the present review application.

8. Even otherwise, instant review application has been filed through a new counsel, who has filed his power of attorney with the application, who was neither an arguing counsel nor was present at the time of passing of the order dated 08.12.2025 in the Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has repeatedly deprecated the conduct of the parties of changing their counsel and filing review petitions. In ***T.N. Electricity Board & Anr. v. N. Raju Reddiar & another, (1997) 9 SCC 736*** it has been held as under: -



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

6

"1. It is a sad spectacle that new practice unbecoming of worthy and conducive to the profession is cropping up. Mr. Mariaputham, Advocate-on-Record had filed vakalatnama for the petitioner-respondent when the special leave petition was filed. After the matter was disposed of, Mr. V. Balachandran, Advocate had filed a petition for review. That was also dismissed by this Court on April 24, 1996. Yet another advocate, Mr. S.U.K. Sagar, has now been engaged to file the present application styled as "application for clarification", on the specious plea that the order is not clear and unambiguous. When an appeal/special leave petition is dismissed, except in rare cases where error of law or fact is apparent on the record, no review can be filed; that too by the advocate on record who neither appeared nor was party in the main case. It is salutary to note that Court spends valuable time in deciding a case. Review petition is not, and should not be, an attempt for hearing the matter again on merits. Unfortunately, it has become, in recent time, a practice to file such review petitions as a routine; that too, with change of counsel, without obtaining consent of the advocate on record at earlier stage. This is not conducive to healthy practice of the Bar which has the responsibility to maintain the salutary practice of profession. In Review Petition No.2670/96 in CA No.1867/92, A Bench of three Judges to which one of us, K. Ramaswamy, J., was a member, has held as under:

"The record of the appeal indicates that Shri. Sudarsh Menon was the Advocate-on-Record when the appeal heard and decided on merits. The Review Petition has been filed by Shri. Prabir Chowdhury who was neither an arguing counsel when the



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

7

appeal was heard nor was he present at the time of arguments. It is unknown on what basis he has written the grounds in the Review Petition as if it is a rehearing of an appeal against our order. He did not confine to the scope of review. It would be not in the interest of the profession to permit such practice. That part, he has not obtained "No Objection Certificate" from the Advocate-on-Record in the appeal, in spite of the fact that Registry had informed him of the requirement for doing so. Filing of the "No Objection Certificate" would be the basis for him to come on record. Otherwise, the Advocate-on-Record is answerable to the Court. The failure to obtain the "No Objection Certificate" from the erstwhile counsel has disintitiled him to file the Review Petition. Even otherwise, the Review Petition has no merits. It is an attempt to re-argue the matter on merits. On these grounds, we dismiss the Review Petition."

2. *Once the petition for review is dismissed, no application for clarification should be filed, much less with the change of the advocate-on-record. This practice of changing the advocates and filing repeated petitions should be deprecated with heavy hand for purity of administration of law and salutary and healthy practice."*

9. In view of the above, no ground to review the order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure A-1) is made out. This Court is inclined to impose exemplary costs upon the review applicants/petitioners No.10, 12, 13 & 14, however, considering their status and circumstances, this Court



CM-3225-CWP-2026,
CM-3224-CWP-2026 in/and
RA-CW-113-2026 in
CWP-25785-2013

abstained itself from imposing any costs. Consequently, the instant review application is dismissed.

10. Since the review application is dismissed, therefore, no orders are required to be passed in the application for condonation of delay.

10.03.2026
kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No