

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Review Petition (Writ) No. 33/2022

Balveer Kumar S/o Sh. Mohanlal Vishnoi, Aged About 43 Years,
Likhmisar, Chak 1 Sgr/a, Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Executive Irrigation North Hanumangarh.
2. Superintending Engineer, Water Resources Circle, Hanumangarh.
3. Executive Engineer, Water Resources Circle, Hanumangarh.
4. Mahaveer Kumar S/o Sh. Mohanlal Vishnoi, Likhmisar, Chak 1 Sgr/a, Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
5. Krishan Singh S/o Sh. Roop Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
6. Daljeet Singh S/o Sh. Roop Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
7. Jeet Singh S/o Sh. Roop Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
8. Mander Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
9. Manjeet Singh S/o Sh. Roop Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
10. Jasveer Singh S/o Sh. Chand Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
11. Gurmail Singh S/o Sh. Maghar Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
12. Lachman Singh S/o Sh. Maghar Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
13. Kulvindra Singh S/o Sh. Maghar Singh, Chak Sundar Singh Wala (1-Sgr/a), Tehsil Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : None present.
For Respondent(s) : Smt. Jaya Dadhich.

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI

Order

20/04/2026

1. The writ review petition under filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Order 47 Rule 1 CPC assailing the order/judgment dated 14.12.2021 passed by this Court, whereby the Court has not considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the respondent No.5 to 13.
2. Even in second round, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner.
3. This Court, in the narrow compass of the review jurisdiction, does not find any reason because the stand of the State regarding the additional *Naka* was the basis of the judgment and not anything else.
4. In view of the above, no interference in the review petition is called for and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J.