

ORDER SHEET  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR**  
**Civil Revision No. S – 171 of 2024**

Date of hearing	Order with signature of Judge
-----------------	-------------------------------

**Application in disposed of matter**  
For orders on CMA No.585/2025 (Review)

**29.05.2025**

None present.

.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-.-

Through this review application, the applicants seek review of the judgment dated 04.03.2025, whereby their Civil Revision was dismissed and the judgment and decree dated 29.05.2024 and 31.05.2024, respectively, passed by learned Ist Additional District Judge, Naushahro Feroze in Civil Appeal No. 212 of 2019, were maintained.

Perusal of the grounds raised in the review application reveals that the applicants have attempted to re-argue the very merits of their Civil Revision, which already stood adjudicated through a well-reasoned judgment. It is contended that the trial Court had rightly decreed the suit and that the appellate Court erred in remanding the matter for further evidence, including summoning the Mukhtiarkar, despite his prior written statement and submission of documents by a clerk from the Assistant Commissioner’s office. However, these arguments were fully addressed in the detailed judgment dated 04.03.2025.

It was held therein that the appellate Court, upon identifying serious procedural omissions, particularly the failure of the trial Court to examine key official witnesses (including the Tapedar and Mukhtiarkar), rightly exercised its jurisdiction under Order XLI Rules 25 and 27 CPC. The directions issued for recording additional evidence were within the bounds of law and intended to ensure complete adjudication on serious allegations of forgery and collusion, as well as to clarify disputed revenue entries and mortgage claims.

It is a well-settled principle that the scope of review under Section 114 read with Order XLVII Rule 1, CPC is limited to correction of errors apparent on the face of the record, and does not extend to re-hearing or reassessing findings on facts or law already decided. No such error, illegality, or omission is apparent from the record that would warrant interference through review.

In view of the above, and in the absence of any substance in the review application, this Court finds no ground to entertain the same. Accordingly, the review application is **dismissed in *limine***.

J U D G E

Abdul Basit