

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.414 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 11382 of 2015

- =====
1. Sunil @ Sunil Kumar, son of Sri Ram Nawmi Singh, resident of village – Benipur, P.O. – Karouta, District – Patna.
 2. Shankar Prasad, son of Ram Nath Prasad Gupta, resident of village + P.O. – Karagola Road, Guru Bazar Bari Nagar, District – Katihar.
 3. Manoj Kumar, son of Nageshwar Singh, resident of village – Auliabad, P.O. – Hayaghat, District – Darbhanga.
 4. Randhir Kumar, son of Maheshwar Singh, resident of village + P.O. – Gushrema, District – Darbhanga.
 5. Md. Salim, son of Md. Jakhirul Hassan, resident of village – Balbhadrapur, P.O. – Gaopur, District- Samastipur.
 6. Shyam Deo, son of Gopal Prasad Gupta, resident of village + P.O. – Hayaghat Bazar, District – Darbhanga.
 7. Deepak Kumar, son of Late Bhulan Singh, resident of village + P.O. – Maniyarpur, District – Vaishali.
 8. Balister Kumar, son of Late Bhulan Singh, resident of village + P.O. – Maniyarpur, District – Vaishali.
 9. Sudhir Kumar, son of Suresh Singh, resident of village – Nardipur, District – Patna.
 10. Nand Kishore, son of Devendra Prasad, resident of village – + P.O. – Baijalpur, Nayatola, District – Saran.
 11. Sant Kumar, son of Late Narayan Singh, resident of village – Sirkuhia, P.O. – Jaitpur, District – Muzaffarpur.
 12. Ranjan Kumar, son of Bhujawan Manjhi, resident of village – Ram Nagar, P.O. Sardha, District – Saran.

.... Petitioners

Versus

Union of India through Sr. Divisional Personnel officer E.C. Railway,
Sonpur.

.... Respondent

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Surya Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent : None.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

And

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH)

3. 11-01-2017

Heard learned counsel for the review petitioners.

The first ground seeking review is, when the writ petition was disposed of he was not heard. We have recorded this fact in the



writ petition's order itself that in spite of repeated calls no one appeared. We had, with the assistance of respondent's counsel, perused the record and passed the order. If a party does not appear and the proceedings are disposed of ex parte, he cannot make a grievance thereof. There is no reason shown why he could not appear.

The order passed in the writ petition also we have noted that it does not cause any prejudice to the writ petitioners inasmuch as the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, which has been upheld, has been qualified by us clearly stating that the writ petitioners would make a representation to the railways giving out details of the party during which they had worked with proof thereof and railways would pass orders appropriately on those petitions. This is the normal procedure as well.

Therefore, if the Central Administrative Tribunal so ordered and this court affirmed and there was no error committed, we see no merit in this review application. This civil review application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)

(Nilu Agrawal, J.)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

