



2026:CGHC:9789-DB



2026:CGHC:9789-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****REVP No. 51 of 2026**

1 - Jumana Rajas D/o Hakimuddin Rajas Aged About 31 Years R/o Imlipara Infront Of Muslim Saray, Kesharvani Provision Gali, Gali No. 6, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Preeti Chandak D/o Meethalal Kela Aged About 42 Years R/o Near Shitla Mandir, Bazarpara, Bemetara, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Jarina Siddiqui D/o Hasim Khan Aged About 42 Years R/o Hn - 424 Main Road, Ramzani Baba Majar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Viyata Chandra C/o Mrinal Kanti Chandra Aged About 37 Years R/o 321, Phase 2, Hariomdal Nursery School, Rajkishore Nagar, Lingiyadih, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioners**versus**

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Director, Directorate Of Medical Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Director, Directorate of Health And Family Welfare, Mahanandi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Atal Nagar, Chhattisgarh.

3 - Secretary, Chhattisgarh Public Service Commission, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

4 - Secretary, Rehabilitation Council of India, NRCP Colony, Block B, Qutab Institutional Area, New Delhi – 110016.

5 - Secretary, National Medical Commission Pocket 14, Sector - 8, Dwarka, Phase -1, New Delhi.

... Respondents



For Petitioners	: Mr. Himanshu Pandey, Advocate
For State/Respondent Nos. 1, 2 & 4	: Mr. Shashank Thakur, AAG
For Respondent No. 3	: Dr. Sudeep Agrawal, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

25.02.2026

1. Heard Mr. Himanshu Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. Shashank Thakur, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing for the State/respondent Nos.1, 2 & 4 and Dr.Sudeep Agrawal, learned counsel, appearing for respondent No.3 / PSC.
2. The present review petition has been filed by the review petitioners seeking review of the order dated 03.02.2026 passed by this Court in WPS No. 8772 of 2025, by which this Court had dismissed the said writ petition filed by the review petitioners.
3. Learned counsel for the review petitioners submits that while passing the order dated 03.02.2026 in WPS No. 8772/2025, this Court in paragraph 12 of the said order observed that petitioner No. 4 had earlier challenged the same Gazette Notification dated 09.09.2024 in WPS No. 956/2025 and that the said petition stood dismissed after upholding the validity of the notification. It is submitted that the said observation is factually incorrect and



contrary to the record. It is contended that WPS No. 956/2025 was in fact dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh, vide order dated 02.05.2025. It is further submitted that this fact was specifically disclosed in paragraph 6 of WPS No. 8772/2025 and also in the rejoinder filed by the petitioners, wherein a copy of the order dated 02.05.2025 was annexed as Annexure Ad-1.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.3 does not dispute the said fact.
5. Having considered the submissions and perused the record, this Court finds that the observation made in paragraph 12 of the order dated 03.02.2026 passed in WPS No. 8772/2025 to the effect that WPS No. 956/2025 was dismissed after upholding the validity of the Gazette Notification dated 09.09.2024 is factually incorrect. The record indicates that the said writ petition was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh and there was no adjudication on merits with regard to the validity of the notification.
6. The aforesaid error is apparent on the face of the record and warrants correction in exercise of review jurisdiction.
7. Accordingly, the review petition is allowed to the limited extent that the observation contained in paragraph 12 of the order dated 03.02.2026 passed in WPS No. 8772 of 2025, stating that WPS No. 956/2025 was dismissed after upholding the validity of the Gazette Notification dated 09.09.2024, is hereby recalled and substituted with the following:



“Petitioner No. 4 had earlier filed WPS No. 956/2025 challenging the Gazette Notification dated 09.09.2024; however, the said writ petition was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh, vide order dated 02.05.2025, and there was no adjudication on merits with regard to the validity of the said notification.”

8. It is clarified that except to the extent indicated hereinabove, the order dated 03.02.2026 passed in WPS No. 8772 of 2025 shall remain unaltered.
9. The review petition stands disposed of accordingly. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice