

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Review No 58 of 2015**

**IN**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 8182 of 2013**

=====

Surendra Kumar Pandey. Son of Shri Parmanand Pandey. Resident of village & P.O. - Karma Borwa, Via - Jhajha, P.S. - Jhajha, Dist.- Jamui.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through Chief Post Master General, Bihar Circle, Patna.
2. The Chief Post Master General, Bihar Circle, Patna.
3. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Munger Division, Munger.
4. Smt. Urmila Kumari. Wife of Shri Kamdeo Prasad Barnwal. Resident of village & P.O.- Karma Borwa, Via - Jhajha, P.S.- Jhajha, Dist.- Jamui, ex EDBPM, Karma Borwa EDBO in account with Jhajha S.O. in Munger Postal Division.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Amar Nath Jha, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr Sanjay Kumar, ASG

=====

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH**

**And**

**HON'BLE JUSTICE SMT NILU AGRAWAL**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**(Per: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)**

**Date: 26-07-2016**

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for Union of India.

**2** This review application is thoroughly misconceived. The review applicant was respondent No 4 and was fully heard when the writ petition was disposed of noticing that the review applicant (respondent No 4 in the writ petition) had more marks than the writ petitioner (respondent No 4 in this review application) but considering the other parameters, writ petitioner was selected which selection

cannot be termed as illegal in any manner. Respondent No 4 (the review applicant) wants rehearing the writ petition which is not permissible.

**3** This review application is thoroughly misconceived and is dismissed accordingly.

**(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)**

**M.E.H./-**

**(Nilu Agrawal, J)**

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|