

A

KONDOPANT  
v.  
ARJUNA AND ORS.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1995

B

[K. RAMASWAMY AND B.L. HANSARIA, JJ.]

*Review Petition—Raising of additional grounds in—Held not a ground for review.*

C

While disposing the appeal this Court stated that the declaration of the respondent, the petitioner herein, as a surplus holder under the Land Ceiling Act was correct and he may file a review petition in case he was found to be within the ceiling limit.

D

Dismissing the review petition, this Court

**HELD :** The act of declaration as a surplus holder is not disputed in the review petition. But additional grounds have been raised. Therefore, that would not be a ground to review the order. [583-B]

E

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Review Petition No. 1347 of 1995.

IN

Civil Appeal No. 2446 of 1978

F

From the Judgment and Order dated 11.7.78 of the Bombay High Court in F.A. NO. 155 of 1971.

S.V. Desh Pande for the Petitioner/Appellant.

The following Order of the Court was delivered :

G

In our order dated May 2, 1995 we had stated that Shri Parekh, Learned counsel appearing for the appellants, had raised ground No. 5 and also produced a certified copy to show that the respondent was declared to be a surplus holder and he was in excess of the land under the Land Ceiling Act. The surplus land was assigned to the appellants. Since counsel

H

for the review petitioner, viz., the respondents in the S.L.P., had reported

that in spite of their contracting the party, they could not get any response from them, we had stated that the declaration of the respondents as a surplus holder is correct and in case he was found to be within the ceiling limit, liberty was given to him to file review petition within a period of two months from today. The said fact is not disputed in the review petition. But additional grounds have now got to be raised. Therefore, that would not be a ground for us to review the order. A B

The review petition is accordingly dismissed.

T.N.A.

Petition dismissed.