



1

Division Bench

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR (C.G.)

Review Petition No. 101/2012

APPLICANT:

Girish Kumar Sahu, S/o Shri Duleshwar
Kumar Sahu, Aged about 25 years, R/o
Village Chivari, Post Sirri, Tahsil Kurud,
District- Dhamtari (C.G.)

10/1/12
F.No. _____
Presented by Shri. _____
Dated 11/6/12

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS:

(RESPONDENTS)

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through- Secretary, Department of
Panchayat and Rural Development,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur
(C.G.)
2. Chief Executive Officer
Janpad Panchayat Kurud
District Dhamtari (C.G.)
3. Dewan Kumar Sahu, S/o Shri Kejram
Sahu, Aged about 35 years, R/o Village
Sakari, Tahsil Kurud, District- Dhamtari
(C.G.)

(FORMAL

RESPONDENT)

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE ORDER DATED 03/05/2012

PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL No. 154//2011

62/3/10/12

25

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

D.B.: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Abhay Manohar Sapre &
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Review Petition No.101 of 2012

APPLICANT

Girish Kumar Sahu

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of Chhattisgarh and others

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE ORDER DATED
03.05.2012 PASSED IN WRIT APPEAL NO.154/2011

ORDER (In chamber)
(28.09.2012)

Abhay Manohar Sapre, J.

This is a review petition filed by the applicant against the common order dated 03.05.2012 passed by this Court in Writ Appeal No.154/2011 and other connected appeals under Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P. Code.

(2) By the impugned order, the writ appeal was dismissed by this Court.

(3) On perusal of the record of the case in chamber as per Rule 90 (2) of Chhattisgarh High Court Rules, we are of the considered opinion that the grounds which are sought to be made subject matter of this review petition do not satisfy the requirement of Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P. Code and, therefore, no review can be filed and if filed, the same cannot be entertained. In other words, we have not been able to notice

any error much less error apparent on the face of the record of the case within the meaning of Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P. Code and hence, the review is not tenable. It is liable to be dismissed in limine.

(4) In our view, the grounds which are sought to be raised in the review petition may be good grounds for appeal, if filed, but not for review. What may be good in appeal may not be good for review though vice versa may hold good.

(5) We, therefore, do not wish to deal with each and every ground in detail on facts.

(6) It is with these observations; we find no merit in this review petition. It fails and is accordingly dismissed in limine.

Sd/-
Abhay Manohar Sapre
Judge

Sd/-
Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Judge

shyna