



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CM-6755-LPA-2025 in/and  
RA-LP-95-2025 (O&M) in  
LPA-1960-2025  
Date of Decision: 10.09.2025

DR. SAROJ DEVI ..... Appellant(s)  
Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ..... Respondent(s)

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

Present: Mr. Keshav Gupta, Advocate  
for review applicant-respondents no.3 to 7.

\*\*\*\*

LISA GILL, J.

1. By way of this application applicant-respondents no.3 to 7 seek review of order dated 11.07.2025, passed in LPA-1960-2025, passed by Co-ordinate Bench, of which one of us (Meenakshi I. Mehta, J.) was a member.

2. Learned counsel for applicants argues that order dated 11.07.2025 has been incorrectly passed in as much as upon expressing a mere *prima facie* opinion, that final relief cannot be granted by way of an interim order in a writ of *quo warranto*, it has been directed that effect and operation of interim order dated 20.05.2025, passed in pending writ petition would remain stayed during its pendency. It is submitted that fate of present applicants during pendency of the writ petition has been sealed by way of this order.

3. Having heard learned counsel for applicant-respondents no.3 to 7, we do not find any ground to review or recall order dated 11.07.2025. He is unable to point out any grounds whatsoever for the same. To the contrary, we find that learned counsel for applicants seeks to re-argue the matter in the garb of this application and seeks to assail order dated 11.07.2025 on merits.

4. 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.”

5. Learned counsel for applicant-respondents no.3 to 7 is unable to point out any ground whatsoever which calls for review of order dated 11.07.2025.

6. Review application is accordingly dismissed being devoid of any merit.

**(LISA GILL)  
JUDGE**

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)  
JUDGE**

**10.09.2025**  
Sunil

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