

GAHC010184392025



undefined

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Review.Pet./220/2025

M/S PHEROS STRUCTURAL PVT. AND ANR
REGISTERED OFFICE AT INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, BAMUNIMAIDAM,
GUWAHATI 781021, ASSAM, REPRESENTED BY SHRI VIVEK SINGH, THE
MANAGING DIRECTOR.

2: SHRI VIVEK SINGH
S/O SHRI B.P. SINGH
RESIDENT OF HOUSE NO 5A
HEMLATA HERITAGE
NEAR AGP OFFICE
LATASIL AMBARI
GUWAHATI
ASSA

VERSUS

THE ASSAM INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION AND 2 ORS
GOVT. OF ASSAM UNDERTAKING INDUSTRIAL ESTATE,
BAMUNIMAIDAM, GUWAHATI 781021, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR.

2:THE MANAGING DIRECTOR
THE ASSAM INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION
GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM UNDERTAKING INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
BAMUNIMAIDAM
GUWAHATI 781021

3:THE GENERAL MANAGER
THE ASSAM INDUSTRIAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION
GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM UNDERTAKING INDUSTRIAL ESTATE
BAMUNIMAIDAM, GUWAHATI 78102

For petitioner/appellant(s) : Mr. Sachit Sharma, Advocate

For respondent(s) : Mr. S. Chamaria, SC, AIIDC

– BEFORE –
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. ASHUTOSH KUMAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MICHAEL ZOTHANKHUMA

25.09.2025

(Ashutosh Kumar, CJ)

This review petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking a review of the order dated 23.07.2025 passed by this Court in WA No. 309/2024.

Heard Mr. Sachit Sharma, learned counsel for the review petitioner, and Mr. S. Chamaria, learned Standing Counsel, AIIDC, for the respondents.

The reason for filing this review petition appears to be that though the petitioner has paid to the respondent corporation an amount in excess of his obligation, but despite assurance from the respondents that the excess amount shall be returned to him, the same has not been done.

The review petitioner therefore requires a quantified account of money due to the petitioner.

The learned counsel for the respondents, however, submits that all disputes now stand settled and nothing is due against the petitioner.

Though no review petition lies for such a prayer, but it is expected that for the amount paid by the petitioner, he would be provided with necessary accounting and a quantified statement for him to know as to what amount was actually due against him.

With the afore-noted clarification in the order dated 23.07.2025, this review petition stands disposed off.

JUDGE

CHIEF JUSTICE

Comparing Assistant