

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.281 of 2016

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8535 of 1999

=====

1. Sajeevan Devi w/o Late Raghubar Dayal Sharma, Residing at Mohalla-Madhubagh, Nawada, Near- Jain College, P.S. + P.O.- Nawada, District-Bhojpur (Ara) 802301

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Panjab National Bank through the Chairman cum Managing Director, 7, Bhikhajee Kama Place, Africa Avenue, New Delhi- 110066
2. The General/Zonal Manager, Punjab National Bank, Chanakya Place, R-Block, Birchand Patel Path, Patna- 800001
3. The Regional Manager, Punjab National Bank, 2nd Floor, Hotel Regal Complex, East Ramna Road, Arrah, District- Bhojpur- 802301
4. The Sr. Branch Manager, Punjab National Bank, Chowk, Arrah, Bhojpur- 802301

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chiranjiva Ranjan

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mahesh Narayan Parbat, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Abhay Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI

SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 31-08-2016 Heard learned Counsel for the parties
concerned.

This application, seeking review of the judgment and order, dated 19.05.2015, passed in CWJC No. 8535 of 1999, has been filed on the ground that there are certain errors apparent on record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner appears to be right in his plea that the date of birth of her husband has been wrongly held to be 31.03.1942 in stead of

01.03.1942. This is primarily a typographical error.

It is accordingly directed that wherever 31.03.1942 occurs as the date of birth of the petitioner's husband, in the judgment and order, dated 19.05.2015, the same shall be read as 01.03.1942.

It has also been pointed out that the records show that the petitioner's husband, died on 17.06.1998; whereas, in the judgment and order, under review, 01.06.1998 has been mentioned as the date of death of petitioner's husband.

In this regard also, the plea of the learned Counsel for the petitioner appears to be correct. The date of death of the petitioner's husband shall be treated as 17.06.1998. To this effect, there is typographical error, which is being rectified by the present order.

However, on perusal of the judgment and order, under review, I find that these corrections, as mentioned above, are not capable of changing the final decision of this Court in the judgment and order, dated 19.05.2015.

Needless to say that for all purposes, the date of death of the petitioner's husband shall be treated as 17.06.1998 and the respondents shall be required to proceed accordingly.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has

submitted that as a consequence of quashing of the order, dated 31.01.1998, the petitioner’s husband ought to be treated as in service on the date of his death and accordingly the petitioner is entitled for all consequential benefits including benefit of compassionate appointment.

It has been indicated in the judgment and order, under review, that consequent upon quashing of the order, dated 31.01.1998, the petitioner would be entitled to receive salary which her husband would have been entitled to receive had he been in service up to the death of his death (17.06.1998).

The claim that the petitioner will be entitled for compassionate appointment is wholly misconceived.

This review application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	X
---	---	---	---