



1

RP-1146-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE MILIND RAMESH PHADKE

ON THE 4th OF SEPTEMBER, 2025

REVIEW PETITION No. 1146 of 2025

VIJAY KUMAR SAHANI

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Anurag Mishra - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Ks Tomar Ga appearing on behalf of Advocate General[r-1].
.....

ORDER

The present Review Petition has been filed for reviewing the order dated 24.6.2025 passed in W.P.No.2932/2008.

2. The said writ petition was partly allowed and disposed of in the following manner:

"4. In compliance of the aforesaid order, respondent No.2 wrote letters to the petitioner asking him to submit form for earned leave, despite of which he did not appear in the office and it was on 01.09.2006 submitted that since he had already worked, question of submission of leave application doesn't arose. Thereafter, on 30.06.2006 and 11.01.2007, show cause notices were issued to the petitioner for hearing/questioning that either he should submit leave application for his absence from 05.08.2002 to 24.08.2002 or submit documentary evidence with regard to working on the aforesaid period, but the petitioner neither appeared before the authority concerned nor produced any documentary evidence to show his bonafide absence, thus, the



authority concerned in light of the provisions of Section 31(3) of the M.P. Civil Services (Leave) Rules, 1977 [which reads thus "the authority competent to grant leave may commute retrospectively periods of absence without leave into extraordinary leave] had sanctioned extraordinary leave without pay for his unauthorized absence from 05.08.2002 to 24.08.2002 (20 days) vide order dated 09.04.2007 (Annexure P/1) which in the obtaining facts and circumstances of the case, doesn't warrant any interference by this Court.

5. Accordingly, the present petition sans merits is hereby dismissed."

3. After hearing counsel for the petitioner and perusing the record, this Court doesn't find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order herein nor there is any error apparent on the face of record, which could be pointed out by the counsel for the petitioner, as no any ground as mentioned under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC has been taken or has been demonstrated in the present petition which could entail this Court to recall or review the order impugned.

4. Accordingly, this review petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

(MILIND RAMESH PHADKE)
JUDGE

(aspr)