

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

**Civil Review No.449 of 2016**

**In**

**LPA 1100 of 2013**

=====

Shaimun Nisha, D/O Md. Khaiar Ahmad, R/O Village + P.O. - Rajpur,  
District - Rohtas

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Government Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Primary Education, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Rohtas, Sasaram
5. The District Education Officer, Rohtas, Samara
6. The Block Development Officer, Sanjhauli, Rohtas
7. The Block Education Officer, Sanjhauli, Rohtas
8. The Pramukh Panchayat Samiti, Sanjhauli, Rohtas
9. The District Teachers Appointment Appellate Tribunal, Rohtas, Sasaram.
10. Sahajadi Khatoon, W/O Khurshid Alam, R/O Village + P.O. - Rajan Dih, P.S. - Rajpur, District - Rohtas.

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Chandra, Advocate  
Mr. Amit Pandey, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ranjan Kumar, AC to AAG-12

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH**

**And**

**HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL**

ORAL ORDER

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

**3. 23-02-2017**

**I.A. No. 8290 of 2016**

There is delay in filing the Review Application.

For the reasons mentioned in the petition, the delay in filing the Review Application is condoned.

Accordingly, Interlocutory Application No. 8290 of 2016 stands disposed of.



**Re: Civil Review No. 449 of 2016**

The writ petition and the Intra-Court Appeal both having been dismissed clearly holding that in spite of notice petitioner did not appear. The petitioner wants to re-argue the matter that notice was not served. That is not permissible, especially in view of the fact that registered notice was sent to the petitioner at her work place that is the school in which she was teaching. It was not returned unserved, and thus, the presumption of service, she was unable to rebut the same.

In our view, if she is aggrieved by decision of this Court, she had other remedies, but review application is certainly not maintainable.

This review application is, thus, dismissed.

**(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J.)**

**(Nilu Agrawal, J.)**

Rajeev/-

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

