

RA-CW-303-2025 in

CWP-26760-2019

Date of Decision: September 09, 2025

BHAG SINGH AND OTHERS

..... Petitioners

Versus

COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA AND OTHERS

..... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Jagdeep Jaswal, Advocate for the applicant-petitioners.

LISA GILL, J.

1. Present application has been filed for review of decision dated 19.05.2025 passed in CWP-26760-2019, whereby said writ petition was disposed of.

2. Learned counsel for applicant-petitioner vehemently argues that order dated 19.05.2025 disposing of writ petition whereby petitioners have been held entitled to question and challenge their termination before Labour Court/ Industrial Court is incorrect. Impugned order dated 19.05.2025 passed by learned Tribunal should have been set aside with relief of regularization of petitioners' services granted.

3. Learned counsel for applicant-appellant in the garb of this application seeks to re-argue the entire matter. 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 19.05.2025. 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.”

4. Learned counsel for applicant-petitioner is unable to point out any ground whatsoever which calls for review of order dated 19.05.2025.
5. Review application is dismissed being devoid of any merit.

**(LISA GILL)
JUDGE**

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE**

September 09, 2025

Rts

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