

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Review No.279 of 2016**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10827 of 2013**

=====

Ganesh Kumar Das son of late Rupan Das, Resident of village  
Bhawanipur, P.O. Pathakdih, P.S. Amdanda, District-Bhagalpur.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar,  
Patna
2. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
3. Deputy Development Commissioner, Bhagalpur.
4. Deputy Development Commissioner cum Managing Director and  
Director, Account Administration and Self Employment, District  
Rural Development Authority, Bhagalpur.

.... .... Respondents/Opp.Parties.

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha  
Mr. Dharendra Nath Jha, Advocates.  
For the State : Mr. Kameshwar Kumar GP-17

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR**  
**MANDAL**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      05-10-2016                      Heard Mr. Jha for the petitioner and State.

The petitioner of CWJC No. 10827 of 2013 has filed the present application seeking review of the order dated 19.04.2016 whereby considering the statements made in the counter affidavit , the Court found that the grievance of the petitioner, in so far as the payment of the lawful dues of the petitioner is concerned, has been redressed. The writ application was dismissed as having become infructuous. The Court further granted liberty to the petitioner to ventilate his other grievance with regard to the outstanding dues/claims against the State


respondent before the appropriate authority for consideration and disposal in accordance with law.

The writ application was filed for a direction commanding the respondents to provide work to the petitioner under NRLM, a Central Government Scheme. The petitioner also prayed for a direction upon the respondents to make payment of the works which has already been done /completed. Having considered the materials on record and upon hearing the counsel for the State, the writ application was disposed of recording the relevant stand of the State respondents in the counter affidavit.

Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had also, in fact, prayed for a direction to provide the petitioner work under NRLM. In my view, considering the narrow confines of the jurisdiction, the application could not be allowed granting him rehearing of the writ petition. The main grievance of the petitioner was for payment of lawful dues, which was considered by the Court under order dated 19.04.2016. The Court also granted liberty to the petitioner to ventilate his grievance before the respondent. If the petitioner was dissatisfied with the order he could have filed an appeal thereagainst and/or utilized the liberty granted by the Court under the said order. In the considered view of the Court, no case for review of the order dated 19.04.2016 is

made out.

The application is dismissed.



**(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)**