

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.38 of 2016

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3356 of 2014

- =====
1. The Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority Patna through its Managing Director .
 2. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Patna
 3. The Secretary, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Industries, Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Industries, Government Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Special Secretary, Department Of Industries, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
4. The Principal Secretary, Public Health And Engineering Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
5. The Engineer-In-Chief, Public Health And Engineering Department, Patna
6. The Superintending Engineer, Public Health And Engineering Circle, Patna
7. Jai Mata Di Incorporation Private Limited, Dhiraj Commercial Complex Boring Road, P.S.- S.K.Puri, District- Patna Through Its Director Dev Jyoti S/O Late Amitabh Chatterjee

.... Opposite party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, Adv. Mr. Sudhanshu Trivedi, Adv. Mr. Abhisekh Singh, Adv.
For the Opp. Party/s	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar No.1, SC-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 06-05-2016

The review application has been filed for review of a part of the order dated 15.12.2015 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 3356 of 2014 (Jai Matadi Incorporation Private Limited vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the observation contained in the later part of the order dated 15.12.2015 to the effect that the concerned authorities shall give due affect to the order dated 12.11.2015, is contrary to the

policy of the respondent no. 7-review petitioner. However, this fact was not brought to the notice of the writ Court at the time of disposal of C.W.J.C. No. 3356 of 2014.

3. In the above view of the matter, this Court is not satisfied that the order under review dated 15.12.2015 suffers from any error apparent on the face of the record. No sufficient reason has been shown even otherwise to justify review of said order. On the contrary, it is stated that for similar grievance, a separate writ petition in C.W.J.C. no. 1038 of 2016 has been filed challenging the order dated 12.11.2015 which is pending before this Court.

4. The review petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	07.05.2016
Transmission Date	