

117 .

2025:PHHC:118844-DB



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

**CM-6578-LPA-2025 in/and
RA-LP-85-2025 (O&M) in
LPA-2994-2024
Date of Decision: 03.09.2025**

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LIMITED AND OTHERS
..... Appellant(s)

Versus

NARAJI DEVI Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: Mr. Deepak Balyan, Advocate
for review applicant-appellants.

LISA GILL, J.

CM-6578-LPA-2025

At request of learned counsel for applicant-appellants, hearing of above mentioned review application is preponed from 16.10.2025 for today itself.

Application is accordingly disposed of.

**RA-LP-85-2025 (O&M) in
LPA-2994-2024**

1. By way of this review application applicant-appellants seeks review of order dated 10.02.2025 whereby appeal filed by them challenging order dated 12.03.2024, passed by learned Single Bench has been dismissed. CWP-4433-2017, filed by respondent-writ petitioner had been allowed by learned Single Bench, whereby writ petitioner was held entitled to benefit under the ex-gratia Assistance Scheme dated 01.08.2006 and all consequential benefits.

2. Having heard learned counsel for applicant-appellants at length, we do not find any ground whatsoever which calls for review of order dated 10.02.2025. Learned counsel for applicant-appellants seeks to re-argue the matter in the garb of present application. He is unable to point out any mistake or error apparent on the face of it or any other ground which calls for review of order dated 10.02.2025. At this stage it is useful to refer to judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in *Sanjay Kumar Agarwal Vs. State Tax Officer (1) and another 2023 AIR (SC) 5636*, wherein after discussing its previous judgments on the question of review of decisions, the gist thereof has been culled out as under:-

“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 reargue 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.

(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.”

3. Learned counsel for applicant-appellants is unable to point out any ground whatsoever which calls for review of order dated 10.02.2025.

4. It is to be noted that there is a delay of 176 days in filing of review application. The only reason set forth is administrative reasons. Be that as it may, having considered the application on merit, the question of limitation is rendered academic. Application is disposed of accordingly.

5. Review application is dismissed being devoid of any merit.

**(LISA GILL)
JUDGE**

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE**

03.09.2025
Sunil

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No