



5

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Review Petition No. 52 of 2007

**APPLICANT
PETITIONER**

Dr. G.S. Khatri son of Shri B.S. Khatri
aged about 60 years Resident of C-75,
Gayatri Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through:
Secretary Department of Veterinary
Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan Raipur
Chhattisgarh.
2. Deputy Secretary, Department of
Veterinary Mantralaya, D.K.S.
Bhawan, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Director of Veterinary Services
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

(Review Petition under Rule 71 r/w Rule 75 of the Chhattisgarh High Court
Rules, 2005, for review and recall of the order dated 29.08.2006, passed in
Writ Petition (S) No. 1778 of 2005)

(SB: Hon'ble Mr. Satish K. Agnihotri, J.)

Present : Shri F.S. Khare, counsel for the Applicant.
Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the
State/respondents.

ORDER

(Passed on 31st of August, 2007)

1. Delay in filing review petition is condoned.
2. The petitioner has sought review of the order dated 29.08.2006 passed
by this court, on the following grounds:

"2.1. Because this Hon'ble Court did not express any opinion
onto the aspect of aspersion which was the actual cause of passing
the impugned order of compulsory retirement meant to be a
punishment causing serious prejudice against the interests of the
applicant.

57

2.2. Because this Hon'ble Court may also consider that the impugned order of compulsory retirement cannot be utilized as a shortcut to circumvent the provisions of conducting an enquiry before removing the applicant."

3. Admittedly, the petitioner has not pointed out any manifest error on the record and the petitioner has not further brought into the notice, any new fact which could not be produced earlier despite diligent efforts made by the petitioner. It is well settled principles of law that the review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, even in exercise of review jurisdiction by the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution. The applicant has not produced any new ground for review, except the same ground which has been considered and decided in the writ petition.

4. There is no material to review the order dated 29.08.2006, passed by this court in W.P. (S) No. 1778 of 2005.

5. Accordingly, this review petition stands dismissed for the reason mentioned above.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge