



2026:CGHC:18366

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****REVP No. 37 of 2026**

1 - Raipur Development Authority Bhakta Mata Karma Commercial Complex, 2nd Floor,
G.E. Road, New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh (Respondent No. 2)

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - Tulesh Sahu S/o Late Shri Sushil Kumar Sahu Aged About 30 Years R/o Santoshi Nagar,
Besides Chhattisgarh Gramin Bank, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh (Petitioner)

2 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Gad, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New
Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh (Respondent No. 1)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Amrito Das, Advocate
For Respondent No. 1	: Mr. Aman Pandey, Advocate
For Respondent No. 2	: Mr. Rohitashwa Singh, Dy. GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput**Order On Board****22.04.2025**

1. The present review petition has been filed by the petitioner under Rule 90 of the High Court of Chhattisgarh Rules, 2007 seeking review of the order dated 06.10.2025 passed by this Court in WPS No. 6686 of 2021.
2. learned counsel for the petitioner submits that father of the petitioner was appointed as against the supernumerary post under the work charge establishment. He submits that the effect of supernumerary post is that it shall cease to exist upon cessation of the employee from the said post. The said fact could be agitated at the time of argument in the writ petition before this Court.

He further submits that if the review petition is not allowed, a great prejudiced would be caused to the petitioner. In these circumstances, the review petition may be allowed and the order impugned may be reviewed.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent No. 1 submits that the father of the petitioner was working on the post of Assistant Pumpman and in the year 2009 he continued in service until his demise on 30.04.2021 due to complications arising from COVID-19. It is submitted that in order to regularize the petitioner and other similarly placed daily wagers the said supernumerary posts were created therefore, the respondents cannot be allowed to take a different stand at this stage. He placed reliance upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Sanjay Kumar Agarwal Vs. State Tax Officer** reported in **2023 SCC OnLine SC 1406**.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No. 2 would oppose the submission.
5. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the grounds raised in the present review petition are essentially on merits of the original matter. The petitioner had sufficient opportunity to raise all such grounds at the time of hearing of the writ petition. It has already been dealt with in the impugned order. It is well settled that the scope of review jurisdiction is extremely limited and cannot be invoked as an appeal in disguise. In the present case, no error apparent on the face of the record or any other valid ground for review has been made out. Accordingly, the order sought to be reviewed does not warrant interference by this Court.
6. Consequently, the review petition being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge