IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.559 of 2016
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 10965 of 2014

==========

1. The Registrar, T. M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
2. The Vice Chancellor, T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. Sant Lal Bhagat, S/o Late Dhora Bhagat, R/o Wazid Ali Lane (R.M.S. Colony), Urdu Bazar, P.S. Tatarpur (Kotwali), Town & District - Bhagalpur.
2. The Pro Vice-Chancellor, T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
3. The Registrar, T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
4. The Finance Officer, T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.
5. The Principal, S.M. College, Bhagalpur.
6. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna.
7. The Director, Higher Education Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
8. The State Govt. Auditor, posted in T.M. Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur.

.... Respondents

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioners : Mr. Anjani Kumar, Senior Advocate
Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh,Advocate
For the Respondent State: Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, AAG-15
For the Pvt. Respondent : Mr. Purshottam Kumar Jha, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
ORAL ORDER

5 07-08-2017 Heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the order dated 12.05.2016 passed in the writ application.

If what has been stated by the counsel representing the University that prior to filing of the writ application all dues except one had already been settled by the University is correct, then it is all the more reason why it does not become a ground for review. It can become a ground for enhancement of cost upon the University authorities. The reason for saying so is that the writ was filed on 02.07.2014. It remained pending between

WEB COPY

02.07.2014 to 12.05.2016, i.e. almost two years. Matter was adjourned and even referred to the Lok Adalat which did not beget any response of the kind which is taken today. This Court fails to understand as to what magic happened after passing of the order on 12.05.2016 when the University authorities suddenly realized that the grievance of the private respondent had already been redressed.

It only fortifies the position of the Court that the University is being run in a most inefficient and callous manner and even in judicial matters they are not willing to respond and assist the Court in time. Only when orders are passed adverse to their interest such a plea is taken.

The Court in fact is inclined to enhance the cost instead of reviewing it.

The review application is dismissed being devoid of merit.

The Vice Chancellor and the Registrar may take action against the people who withheld such facts from the Court and make recoveries if they want.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

Pawan/-

U			

WEB COPY