

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.214 of 2014

IN

LPA 939 of 2013

=====

1. Ashok Kumar Son of Sri Hari Narayan Sahu, resident of village and Post Office- Chauhatta, P.S. Kishanpur, District - Supaul

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Supaul
4. The District Education Officer, Supaul
5. The District Superintendent of Education, Supaul
6. The Block Development Officer, Kishanpur, Supaul
7. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Rajpur, Block Kishanpur, District - Supaul
8. The Panchayat Secretary, Gram Panchayat Rajpur, Block Kishanpur, District - Supaul
9. Sri Ranjesh Kumar Singh, Son of Sri Chandeshwar Prasad, resident of Mohalla - Vidyapuri, Ward No.2, P.S. and District - Supaul
10. The Appellate Authority for District Teachers Employment, Supaul, through its Member

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gp14-Manoj Kumar Ambastha
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, AC to GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE I. A. ANSARI

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE I. A. ANSARI)

Date: 23-09-2015

The defects, pointed out by the Registry, are ignored.

In the order, dated 19.06.2014, passed in LPA No.939 of 2013, while dismissing the appeal *in limine*, the Court observed and held as under:



“The appointment relates to the 2007 selection process, irrespective of the extent of handicap suffered by the appellant, he did not secure minimum qualifying marks of 60%. Once the appellant failed to secure the minimum qualifying marks, he could not have been appointed as Panchayat Teacher in any category. His claim for appointment in the handicapped category because of his disability being greater than that of the respondent No.9, is totally misconceived. The claim has rightly been rejected by the learned single Judge.

No case for interference is made out.

Appeal is dismissed *in limine*.”

In the order, dated 19.06.2014, it has been recorded that the appellant did not secure minimum qualifying marks, no case for appointment, in the category of handicapped persons, could be said to have been made out.

Coupled with the above, Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the review petitioner, could not point out any such error in the order, dated 19.06.2014, which would warrant review.

Situated thus, we do not find that any case for review of the order, dated 19.06.2014, has been made out.

It has been submitted, on behalf of the review petitioner, that some developments have taken place subsequent to the order, dated 19.06.2014, aforementioned. If there are some developments subsequent to the order, dated 19.06.2014, it would not render the order, dated 19.06.2014, a subject matter of review.

No case for review having been made out by the review petitioner, the review petition stands dismissed.

No order as to costs.

(I. A. Ansari, ACJ)

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Mkr./-

U			
---	--	--	--