
(2022) 04 MAN CK 0005

In the Manipur High Court

Case No : Review. Petition No. 9, 11 Of 2021

Union Of India; & Anr

APPELLANT

Vs

M/371458 & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 06-04-2022

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2022) 04 MAN CK 0005

Hon'ble Judges : Sanjay Kumar, CJ; Lanusungkum Jamir, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Kh. Samarjit, Kh. Lupenjit

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Sanjay Kumar, C.J

Mr. Kh. Samarjit, learned ASG, appears for the petitioners. Mr. Kh. Lupenjit, learned counsel, appears for the respondents.

The Union of India and the Director General, Assam Rifles, Shillong, Meghalaya, filed these petitions seeking review of the separate orders dated 17.09.2021 passed by this Court, dismissing their condone delay applications in relation to the belated appeals that they wished to file against orders of a learned Judge of this Court. Review Pet. No. 9 of 2021 arises out of MC (W.A.) No. 68 of 2020 while Review Pet. No. 11 of 2021 pertains to MC (W.A.) No. 70 of 2020.

This Court found that the said applications were filed for condonation of delay without even quantifying the delay correctly and there was any amount of carelessness in the drafting of the condone delay applications, manifesting total non-application of mind by the applicants. So much so, the applications did not even disclose correct details. This Court also found that there was no explanation forthcoming to justify the delay. The applications were accordingly dismissed on the ground that they were utterly bereft of merits, apart from lacking in bonafides.

Mr. Kh. Samarjit, learned ASG, appearing for the review petitioners, would fairly state that even if the review petitions are allowed, the only option available to them would be to seek withdrawal of the condone delay applications with liberty to file afresh. In effect, the attempt being made by the review petitioners is to turn back the clock so that they can start from scratch and file fresh condone delay applications. No grounds are pleaded or made out by them to draw any inference of material irregularity or errors apparent on the face of the record, in so far as the dismissal orders are concerned.

The review petitioners are therefore trying to make good their past lapses by seeking review of orders which do not suffer from any illegality or irregularity, warranting such review.

This Court therefore finds no grounds to entertain these review petitions. Review Pet. No. 9 of 2021 and Review Pet. No. 11 of 2021 are accordingly dismissed.

No order as to costs.