

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.326 of 2009

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13364 of 2007

- =====
1. The State of Bihar through the Director, Primary Education, Bihar, Patna
 2. The Accountant General, Bihar Birchand Patel Marg, Patna
 3. The District Superintendent of Education-cum- Sub- Divisional Education Officer, Jamui
 4. The Headmaster-cum- Drawing and Disbursement Officer, Middle School, Mirjaganj (Aliganj), district Jamui
 5. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, Bhagalpur Division, Bhagalpur
 6. The District Superintendent of Education, Munger
 7. Regional Education Officer, Jamui
 8. Block Education Officer, Sikandra, Jamui

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Savitri Devi wife of Sri Anirudh Sharan, resident of Village- Dola, Police Station Pakribarawan, district Nawada

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. S.K.Mallick, AC to SC 25

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Y.V.Giri, Sr. Advocate

Mr Dhananjay Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 25-03-2015

Petitioners are seeking review of the order dated 26.3.2009 passed in CWJC No.13364 of 2007. The ground for review is that after passing of the order the respondent authorities have received some communication from the Bihar School Examination Board which has raised certain doubts with regard to authenticity of the educational certificate of matriculation of the petitioner. They take a plea that her matriculation certificate is forged.

The communication on which such a plea has been taken

and which has formed the basis for filing the review is Annexure- 2 to the review application.

Annexure-2 has no correlation with the position and the stand which was taken by the State itself when the earlier order was passed in the writ application which speaks for itself. Obviously, the writ petitioner is being harassed for other reasons by taking a different varying plea every time when she has already superannuated and approached the High Court for settlement of her post retiral dues.

The reason indicated by the petitioners i.e. the State does not form the basis for review. The review application stands dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

sk

U			
---	--	--	--