

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.500 of 2012

=====

Mahendra Singh, Son of Late Sikarchand Singh, Resident of Village -
Santan Garh, Santawan Bigha, P.O. Bara, Korium, P.S. and District - Arwal
.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar Hindu Religious Trust Board, Vidyapati Marg, Patna
 2. Administrator - Cum - Special Executive Officer, Bihar Hindu Religious Trust Board, Vidyapati Marg, Patna
 3. Assistant Superintendent of Bihar Hindu Religious Trust Board, Vidyapati Marg, Patna. Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kr. Agrawal, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ganpati Trivedi, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH
ORAL ORDER

9 23-09-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
opposite parties.

The petitioner seeks review of order dated
08.10.2012, passed in C.W.J.C. No. 2002 of 2009.

The petitioner had filed C.W.J.C. No. 2002 of 2009
praying therein to quash letter dated 29.05.2008 as well as Memo
dated 07.08.2008 passed by the Religious Trust Board. However,
the Board submitted that both the letters have lost their force as a
new Committed has been constituted for three years. Taking into
consideration that the earlier committee, which was in challenge,
had lost its force and a new committee has been constituted, the
writ application was disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to
challenge the subsequent order constituting a new committee.

The petitioner has sought review of the order dated 08.10.2012 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 2002 of 2009 on the ground that the said committee also lost its force. He further alleges that the Board has misrepresented before the Court.

The petitioner submits that on the date of passing of the order, the new committee was very much in existence. He thus submits that no ground for review of the said order is made out.

Relying upon a decision in case of Bharat Singh & others Vs. State of Haryana, reported in AIR 1988 SC 2181, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Party raising the point must plead not only the facts but also annex evidence in proof of the facts. The reliance of the petitioner in case of Bharat Singh (supra) is misconceived as the facts are different. I find that there is no error apparent in the record of the case, as such the review application is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--