



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,
CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VISHAL MISHRA

ON THE 10th OF APRIL, 2026

REVIEW PETITION No. 1739 of 2025

VINAY SINGH

Versus

THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

.....
Appearance:

Shri Bhupesh Tiwari - Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Anubhav Jain - Government Advocate for the respondents/State.
.....

ORDER

Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice

By this review petition, petitioner seeks review of the order dated 09.02.2024 passed in W.P. No.858/2024.

2. We noticed that the subject petition has been filed with the delay of 558 days. The only ground taken by the petitioner in the review petition that he was not informed by his counsel regarding passing of the order and; as such he could not file review in time. It is further contended that the brother of the petitioner died on 28.10.2023 and subsequently his father also expired on 24.12.2024. and; as such he was demoralised and thus he could not file the petition within time.

3. We note that the writ petition was filed in December, 2023 and the affidavit in support thereof was filed on 1st February, 2024. If the petitioner



was affected by the death of his brother who had expired in October, 2023, he would not have been in a position to file the writ petition. The Writ Petition was filed after the death of the brother so the ground that he was demoralised and he could not file the review petition within time is not believable. Furthermore, there is nothing placed on record to show that from the passing of the order till the review petition was filed with the delay of 558 days, there was any sufficient cause which prevented the petitioner from filing the subject review petition.

4. Even otherwise, we note that the grounds raised by the petitioner in the review petition are in the nature of grounds of appeal which cannot be permitted by way of review petition. No error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed out by the petitioner. Consequently, we are of the view that the review petition is not liable to be entertained primarily on the ground that the same is barred by limitation and there is no sufficient explanation for condoning the delay.

5. In view of the above, the application (IA No.22703/2025) seeking condonation of delay is dismissed. Consequently, the review petition is dismissed being barred by limitation.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VISHAL MISHRA)
JUDGE

YS