



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE ANIL VERMA

ON THE 1st OF MAY, 2025

REVIEW PETITION No. 244 of 2025

RAVINDRA SINGH

Versus

VISHWANATH SINGH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Rudra Pratap Singh Kaurav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Karan Virwani, Advocate for respondents.
.....

ORDER

Heard finally.

2. The petitioner has preferred the instant review petition under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC seeking recalling the earlier order dated 22.01.2025 passed by this Court in Civil Revision No.945/2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Trial Court as well as this Court has over slipped the factual matrix of the dispute which is approach road under the sole ownership of the plaintiff and reserved for approaching his adjoining property so the subject matter is not the sale deed, therefore, valuation of the sale deed is not relevant for compelling the plaintiff to fix the Court fees, therefore, the aforesaid order deserves to be recalled.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents opposed the prayer and prayed for its rejection by supporting the earlier order passed by this



Court.

5. From perusal of the record, it is seen that there is no error apparent on the face of record warranting review of the order. The aforesaid order has been passed after due consideration of the rival submissions made by the parties. Hence, no new ground is made out to review the aforesaid order. However, an attempt has been made to reargue the matter on merits, which is not permissible under the review jurisdiction.

6. The law with respect to review is settled by the Supreme Court. The scope of review is limited as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Senior Divisional Manager, Life Insurance Corporation of India and others Vs. Shree Lal Meena** reported in (2019) 4 SCC 479, and **S. Bagirathi Ammal Vs. Palani Roman Catholic Mission**, reported in (2009) 10 SCC 464 and in the case of **State of West Bengal and others Vs. Kamal Sen Gupta and another** reported in (2008) 8 SCC 612, therefore, no ground is made out for review of the order. No glaring irregularity or illegality could be pointed out by the petitioner in the impugned order. Thus, no interference in the order could be made in this review petition.

7. The review petition sans merits and is accordingly **dismissed**.

(ANIL VERMA)
JUDGE

Abhi