

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.56 of 2017

IN

LPA 314 of 2016

=====

1. Subhendra Jha, son of Late Umapati Jha, R/o Vill- Hanuman Nagar, PO- Bhaur,
PS- Pandaul, Dist- Madhubani.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Chairman, BISCOMAUN.
3. The Managing Director, BISCOMAUN.
4. The Administrator, BISCOMAUN.
5. The Board of Directors, BISCOMAUN.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anju Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. RAJ BALLABH PRASAD YADAV
(AAG XI)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 29-06-2017

Seeking review of an order dated 18.1.2017 passed by
this Court in L.P.A. No.314 of 2016, this application has been filed.

In view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme
Court in the case of Sasi (Dead) Through Legal Representatives vs.
Arabindakshan Nair And Anr., (2017) 4 SCC 692 in which the
principle of law has been laid down in paras 6 to 9 in the following
manner, we find no case made out for review. Paragraph Nos.6 to 9
of the judgment reads as under:

6. The grounds enumerated therein are specific. The



principles for interference in exercise of review jurisdiction are well settled. The Court passing the order is entitled to review the order, if any of the grounds specified in the aforesaid provision are satisfied.

7. in *Thungabhadra Industries Ltd. V. State of A.P.*, the Court while dealing with the scope of review had opined:

“11. What, however, we are now concerned with is whether the statement in the order of September 1959 that the case did not involve any substantial question of law is an “error apparent on the face of the record”. The fact that on the earlier occasion the Court held on an identical State of facts that a substantial question of law arose would not per se be conclusive, for the earlier order itself might be erroneous. Similarly, even if the statement was wrong, it would not follow that it was an “error apparent on the face of the record”, for there is a distinction which is real, though it might not always be capable of exposition, between a mere erroneous decision and a decision which could be characterised as vitiated by “error apparent”. A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected, but lies only for patent error”. (emphasis supplied)

8. In *Parsion Devi v. Sumitri Devi*, the Court after referring to *Thungabhadra Industries Ltd.*, *Meera Bhanja v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhary* and *Aribam Tuleshwar Sharma v. Aribam Pishak Sharma*, held thus:

“9. Under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC, a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self-evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of the jurisdiction under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC it is not



permissible for an erroneous decision to be “reheard and corrected”. A review petition, it must be remembered, has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be “an appeal in disguise”.”

9. The aforesaid authorities clearly spell out the nature, scope and ambit of power to be exercised. The error has to be self-evident and is not to be found out by a process of reasoning. We have adverted to the aforesaid aspects only to highlight the nature of review proceedings.”

In view of the above, the application is rejected.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Sudhir Singh, J)

K.C.jha/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	5.7.2017
Transmission Date	N/A

