

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No. 502 of 2013

=====

Ram Ishwar Mahto, Son of Raja Mahto, Resident of Village - Inayatpur Parabodhi,
P.S. Sarai, District - Vaishali

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Patna High Court through the Registrar General, High Court, Patna
2. The Registrar General, High Court, Patna
3. The District and Sessions Judge, Vaishali at Hajipur
4. First Additional and Sessions Judge (F.T.C.) cum Enquiry Officer, Civil Court
Vaishali at Hajipur

.... Respondents/Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Naresh Chandra Verma, Advocate
Mr. Natraj Verma, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-10-2016

The review petitioner prays for review of the order passed by a Bench of this Court presided by Mr. Justice Navin Sinha (as His Lordships then was) in C.W.J.C. No. 4503 of 2012, whereby the Bench on the request made by the petitioner, allowed him to represent the disciplinary authority the against the quantum of punishment.

It is the argument of Mr. Natraj Verma, learned counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to the order on the writ petition, he preferred an application before the District Judge, Vaishali which was rejected and against which an appeal has been filed before the Standing Committee which is pending. He also endeavours to question the order passed on the writ petition on merits and to submit

that for a single charge a punishment of dismissal is passed which is very harsh but considering the prayer made in the review application, I am not persuaded to grant indulgence to the argument advanced for learned counsel practically wishes a rehearing of the writ petition which is beyond the scope of review jurisdiction.

Mr. Verma next prays for appropriate direction to the Standing Committee of the High Court for disposal of the appeal but even prayer cannot be accepted in the present application which is filed for review of the order passed on the writ petition and an independent cause of action requires an independent remedy and not by way of review petition.

The review application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J.)

Kundan

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	07.10.2016
Transmission Date	