




IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.99 of 2013

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 267 of 2010

=====

Umesh Ram, son of Late Asharfi Ram, resident of Village & P.O. & P.S.
Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Health, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director-in-Chief, Health Services, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Regional Deputy Director, Health Services, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga
4. The Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Madhubani
5. The Incharge Medical Officer, Primary Health Centre, Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suraj Narain Yadav, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajiv Roy, GP-5
Mr. Suresh Kumar, AC to GP-5
Mr. Arun Kumar, AC to GP-5.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA
And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH
And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR DATTA)

4 27-01-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Government Pleader No. 5 for the State.

The petitioner has filed the review application
with respect to the judgment dated 01.02.2013 passed in CWJC
No. 472 of 2010 heard analogously with CWJC No. 267 of 2010

by a Full Bench of this Court.

While learned counsel for the petitioner was arguing the matter before us referring specially to pages 16 and 17 of the judgment annexed with the review application, we could notice clearly so far as continuity of pages 16 and 17 of the review application is concerned and upon going through the original order as contained in the order sheet of the writ petition, it was discovered that the original page 17 of the said order is completely missing and it is page 18 of the order which has been shown as page 17. Upon perusing the same we asked learned counsel for the petitioner to show how any review would be maintainable in view of the findings recorded by the Full Bench as the same is based upon the decision of the Supreme Court and the present is only a review application and not an appeal against the same.

Upon going through the original order in the file of the writ petition handed over to him, learned counsel for the petitioner admits that in view of what has been stated at page 17 of the order dated 1.2.2013 sought to be reviewed and this being a review application, he does not have anything to say in the matter and since he was not in know of the said part of the order,

he had filed the review application.

In the aforesaid view of the matter, we do not find any merit in the review application. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J)

(V. Nath, J)

S.Pandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--