

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.184 of 2015

IN

LPA 1044 of 2008

- =====
1. The State Of Bihar Through Its Chief Secretary, Old Secretariat Building, Patna.
 2. The Commissioner - cum - Secretary to the Government in the Personnel and Administrative Reforsm Department, Old Secretariat Building, Patna (now Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
 3. The Deputy Secretary to the Government in the Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department, Old SEcretariat Building, Patna (now General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Nathuni Prasad Singh Son of Late Bhikho Singh, Resident of Village Panchgachchia P.S. - Bihra, District - Saharsa.
2. The Member, Board of Revenue - cum - Chairman, Departmental Promotion Committee, Old Secretariat Building, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : M/s.Pushkar Narayan Shahi,Sr.Adv. & Mritunjay Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

Date: 20-01-2016

For the reasons stated in I.A.No. 7952/15, the delay in filing this civil review application is condoned.

2. The State seeks review of the judgment and order of this Court dated 26-3-2015 passed in L.P.A.No. 1044 of 2008, which Letters Patent Appeal was preferred by the State itself.

3. As noticed in the judgment, the State remained

unrepresented. It is urged that as the State was not heard, it may be heard and the judgment may be recalled. We have noticed the facts as to why we had proceed for ex-parte hearing in the judgment itself. We do not find it a fit case to recall the judgment and re-hear the matter.

4. However, we wish to observe that the learned Single Judge had passed two directions; one to make payment to the writ petitioner; and second to consider him for further promotion. The Division Bench in intra-court Appeal noticed and affirmed the first part, but found it unnecessary to comment upon the second part, inasmuch as the second part was only a direction to consider. There was no mandamus in the matter.

5. We, therefore, find no ground to interfere. This review application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

B.K.Roy/-

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

U			
---	--	--	--