



2026:CGHC:3188



2026:CGHC:3188

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 13 of 2026

1 - Muneshwari Devi W/o Shri Dilip Singh Aged About 56 Years R/o House No. 12/h Camp 1, Prem Nagar, Near Panch Mandir Ward No. 20, Supela, Bhilai Distt.- Durg (C.G.)

... **Petitioner**

Versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Women And Child Development, Mantralay, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Collector Durg District Durg (C.G.)

3 - District Program Officer Women And Child Development Department District Durg (C.G.)

4 - Project Officer (Pariyojana Adhikari) Integrated Child Development Project Bhilai-01 District Durg (C.G.)

5 - Municipal Corporation Durg Through Its Commissioner, Municipal Corporation Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.)

6 - Secretary Municipal Corporation Bhilai District Durg (C.G.)

... **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Ms. Deeksha Gouraha, Dy. Government Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

ORDER ON BOARD



20/01/2026

1. This Review Petition is filed by the petitioner seeking review of the order dated 06.10.2025 passed by this Court in WP (S) No. 10871/2025 filed by whereby, learned counsel for the petitioner in view of the objection raised by the counsel for the Respondents/State that the petitioner is having alternate efficacious remedy under Clause 13.4 of the guidelines issued by the Department of Women & Child Welfare, State of Chhattisgarh dated 02.04.2008 for appointment of Anganbadi Worker has withdrawn the writ petition with liberty to avail the other alternate remedy.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the writ petition was filed on the ground that the order of termination of service of the petitioner was passed in violation of principles of natural justice and further, made an attempt to make submission that there is no provision of appeal under the scheme for appointment of Anganbadi Worker. He further submits that even if there is a remedy of appeal, if there is violation of principles of natural justice, the writ petition can be entertained in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
3. Learned counsel for the Respondents/State opposes the submission of counsel for the petitioner and would submit that the review petitioner along with the review petition has filed the directives of the State Government with regard to the appointment of Anganbadi Sahiyaka and Anganbadi Karyakarta dated 02.04.2008 and under Clause 11 of the directives, there is provision for appeal and further under Clause 13.4, it is clearly mentioned that the order of termination/removal of Anganbadi Worker, appeal will lie in accordance with Clause 11 of the directives of the State Government.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and also perused the order dated 06.10.2025 subject matter of review.



5. The relevant portion of the order dated 06.10.2025 is extracted below for ready reference:-

'1. Learned State counsel raised objection that petitioner is having efficacious alternate remedy of appeal under Clause 13.4 of the guideline issued by State Government, Department of Women and Child Welfare dated 02.04.2008 for appointment of Anganbadi Worker, before the Collector against the order impugned (Annexure P-1).'

6. The writ petition was withdrawn by the earlier counsel considering that the petitioner therein is having the remedy of appeal under Clause 13.4 of the circular dated 02.04.2008. The documents enclosed along with the review petition shows that the order of termination/removal is appealable before the Appellate authority as provided under Clause 11 of the directives of the State Government. The order can be reviewed only when there is error apparent on the face of the record.
7. It is well settled that in the guise of review, rehearing is not permissible. In order to seek review it has to be demonstrated that order suffers from error apparent on the face of record. The scope of review is very limited and an order or judgment is open to review only if there is an error apparent on the face of record. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Smt. Meera Bhanja vs Smt. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury** reported in **AIR 1995 SC 455** and **Surendra Kumar Vakil & ors vs. Chief Executive Officer, MP & ors** reported in **(2004) 10 SCC 126** has considered the issue with regard to grounds on which review petition can be considered and it was observed that a point that has been heard and decided cannot form a ground for review even if assuming that the view taken in the judgment under review is erroneous.
8. In the case of **Asharfi Devi (dead) through LRs Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Ors.** reported in **(2019) 5 SCC 86**, it was held thus:

“18. It is a settled law that every error whether factual or legal cannot be made subject matter of review



2026:CGHC:3188

under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code though it can be made subject matter of appeal arising out of such order. In other words, in order to attract the provisions of Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code, the error/mistake must be apparent on the face of the record of the case.”

9. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as also, the fact that admittedly, the petitioner is having the alternate efficacious remedy of appeal in view of the directives issued by the State Government for appointment of Anganbadi Worker/Karyakarta as per Clause 13.4 of the circular dated 02.04.2008, in the opinion of this Court, there is no error apparent on the face of record in the order dated 06.10.2025 subject matter of review and therefore, I do not find any good ground to entertain this review petition.

10. Accordingly, the review petition stands **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge

Dey