

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Review No.376 of 2014**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 12805 of 2007**

- =====
1. The Bihar State Electricity Board through its Chairman, Bailey Road, Patna. Now North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Bailey Road, Patna
  2. The Chairman, Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna. Now M.D. North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna
  3. The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Bailey Road, Patna. Now General Manager (HRD), North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd, Bailey Road, Patna
  4. The Superintending Engineer, Hajipur Electric Supply, Sub-Division, Hajipur, District - Vaishali
  5. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Sub-Division, Hajipur, District - Vaishali

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

Mahesh Rai Son of Late Fagu Rai Resident of Village - Manjhauli Tola Par, Post Office - Bidhupur (R.S.), Police Station - Bidupur, District - Vaishali

.... .... opposite party /s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh

For the opposite party /s : Mr. Ram Sandesh Roy

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      08-02-2017      Heard Sri Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel for the review petitioners and Sri Ram Sandesh Roy, learned counsel for the sole opposite party.

The present review petition has been filed with a prayer to review an order dated 26.6.2013 passed in CWJC No. 12805 of 2007 .

The writ petition was heard. In the writ petition detailed counter affidavit was filed on behalf of the review



petitioner and considering the date of birth recorded in the service book of the petitioner which was not disputed by the respondents of the writ petition, this court allowed the writ petition. Against order of the writ court the review petitioner filed an appeal vide L.P.A. No. 1 of 2014 which was permitted to be withdrawn with liberty to file review petition.

Sri Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel for the review petitioner tried to persuade the court that petitioner had suppressed some material fact in the writ petition. It was submitted by learned counsel for the review petitioner that the petitioner was got medically examined and thereafter his age was assessed whereas even at the time of hearing of this review petition he has not disputed the fact that in the service book the date of birth of the petitioner was recorded as 23.6.1949. The copy of service book was also brought on record in the writ petition and after hearing the parties in detail the order was passed by this court.

The court is of the opinion that there is no ground for interference with the order passed in the writ petition.

The review petition stands dismissed.

**(Rakesh Kumar, J)**

Praful/-

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

