

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION**

REVIEW PETITION (C) No. 963/2025

(Diary No. 10585/2025)

IN

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) No. 15881-2020

SADARAM KANOJE

PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.
2. The review petitioner-Sadaram Kanoje- was the petitioner in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15881 of 2020. The said special leave petition stood dismissed, *vide* our order dated 4th December, 2024, in terms of the order of even date passed in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15588 of 2020. The primary reason for declining relief was that the review petitioner had not completed 10 years of service in order to earn any benefit in terms of paragraph '53' of the Constitution Bench decision of this Court in ***Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi (3)***¹.
3. To the review petition is annexed copy of an order dated 8th January, 1993. Referring to such order, it is the contention of the

1 (2006) 4 SCC 1

review petitioner that he had been appointed as surplus contingency Waterman and that having worked continuously for more than 10 years, notwithstanding that the initial appointment was for a period of 89 days, his writ petition before the High Court ought to be reconsidered. Incidentally, the Single Judge as well as the Division Bench of the High Court did not grant any relief to the review petitioner. According to him, inadvertently, an incorrect order was annexed to the special leave petition and marked annexure P-2, which was an order referring to one Nanubhai Patil [who was the petitioner in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15588 of 2020].

4. Be that as it may, we need not examine whether the order dated 8th January, 1993, is genuine or not. That is a task we propose to leave for the High Court to examine.

5. We are satisfied that the review petitioner has set up a case for review.

6. On review of the order dated 4th December, 2024, dismissing Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15881 of 2020, we recall such order and direct that the review petitioner's writ petition² shall stand revived on the file of the High Court, and the same may be considered in the light of the observations/directions made by us in our order dated 4th December, 2024 in Civil Appeal No.14425 of 2024 arising out of Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.30160 of 2024.

7. The review petition stands allowed and Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15881 of 2020 stands disposed of with the aforesaid direction.

.....J.
(DIPANKAR DATTA)

.....J.
(SANJAY KAROL)

**NEW DELHI;
APRIL 24, 2025.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION**

REVIEW PETITION (C) No.964/2025

(Diary No. 10587/2025)

IN

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) No. 15931/2020

GAJANAND

PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.

2. The review petitioner-Gajanand- was the petitioner in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15931 of 2020. The said special leave petition stood dismissed, *vide* our order dated 4th December, 2024, in terms of the order of even date passed in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15588 of 2020. The primary reason for declining relief was that the review petitioner had not completed 10 years of service in order to earn any benefit in terms of paragraph '53' of the Constitution Bench decision of this Court in ***Secretary, State of Karnataka v. Uma Devi (3)***¹.

3. To the review petition is annexed copy of an order dated 14th September, 1995. Referring to such order, it is the contention of the review petitioner that he had been appointed as surplus contingency Peon and that having worked continuously for more than 10 years, notwithstanding that the initial appointment was for a period of 89 days, his writ petition before the High Court ought to be reconsidered. Incidentally, the Single Judge as well as the Division Bench of the High Court did not grant any relief to the review

1 (2006) 4 SCC 1

petitioner. According to him, inadvertently, an incorrect order was annexed to the special leave petition and marked annexure P-2, which was an order referring to one Nanubhai Patil [who was the petitioner in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15588 of 2020].

4. Be that as it may, we need not examine whether the order dated 14th September, 1995, is genuine or not. That is a task we propose to leave for the High Court to examine.

5. We are satisfied that the review petitioner has set up a case for review.

6. On review of the order dated 4th December, 2024, dismissing Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15931 of 2020, we recall such order and direct that the review petitioner's writ petition² shall stand revived on the file of the High Court, and the same may be considered in the light of the observations/directions made by us in our order dated 4th December, 2024 in Civil Appeal No.14425 of 2024 arising out of Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.30160 of 2024.

7. The review petition stands allowed and Special Leave Petition (Civil) No.15931 of 2020 stands disposed of with the aforesaid direction.

.....J.
(DIPANKAR DATTA)

.....J.
(SANJAY KAROL)

**NEW DELHI;
APRIL 24, 2025.**

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

REVIEW PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 10585/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-12-2024
in SLP(C) No.15881/2020 passed by the Supreme Court of India]

SADARAM KANOJE

Petitioner

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ORS.

Respondents

(With I.A. No.52318/2025-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING REVIEW
PETITION, I.A. No.52323/2025-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE
IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and I.A. No.52320/2025-EXEMPTION FROM FILING
O.T.)

WITH

Diary No(s). 10587/2025 in SLP (C) No.15931/2020(IV-C)
(With I.A. No.52327/2025-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING REVIEW
PETITION, I.A. No.52325/2025-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE
IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and I.A. No.52328/2025-EXEMPTION FROM FILING
O.T.)

Date : 24-04-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KAROL

By Circulation

UPON perusing papers the Court made the following
O R D E R

Review Petition (C) No.963/2025 @ Diary No.10585/2025 in SLP(C)
No.15881/2020

1. Delay condoned.
2. The review petition stands allowed in terms of the signed order.
3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

Review Petition (C) No.964/2025 @ Diary No.10587/2025 in SLP (C) No.15931/2020

1. Delay condoned.
2. The review petition stands allowed in terms of the signed order.
3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(RASHMI DHYANI PANT)
ASST. REGISTRAR-CUM-PS

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)
(signed orders are placed on the file)