

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.453 of 2016

Arising out of

LPA No. 347 of 2015

=====

1. Most. Chandrawati Devi, wife of Late Anandi Prasad,
2. Devnandan Prasad, son of Late Pyare Mahto,
3. Kamala Devi, W/o Late Bhagwat Prasad,
4. Janardan Prasad, Son of Late Kailash Prasad,
5. Pankaj Kumar, Son of Late Babuchand Mahto @ Babuchand Prasad,
6. Jagdish Prasad, Son of Shankar Mahto,
7. Shyam Prasad, Son of Gajadhar Mahto,
8. Mahendra Prasad Singh, Son of Late Harihar Prasad,
9. Pramod Prasad, Son of Sri Sita Ram Prasad,
10. Suresh Prasad, Son of Late Dukhi Mahto, All resident of Village-Balwanpur, P.O.+P.S.- Asthawan, District- Nalanda, Bihar.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary, Bihar.
2. The Union of India through Director National Projects Construction Corporation Ltd., New Delhi.
3. The Project Manager, NPCC Ltd., Nalanda.
4. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Bihar.
5. The P.S. Rural Works Department, Bihar.
6. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
7. The Officer-in-Charge, District Development, Nalanda.
8. The Land Acquisition Officer, Nalanda.
9. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Bihar Sharif, Nalanda.
10. Urmila Devi, wife of Sidheshwar Prasad, at Balwapur, P.S.- Asthawan, District- Nalanda.
11. The Circle Officer, Asthawan, Nalanda.
12. The Block Development Officer, Asthawan, Nalanda.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhola Prasad No.-1

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raj Ballav Prasad Yadav (AAG XI)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL)

Date: 26-04-2017

Heard both sides.

After waiving the objection raised by the office, we have



heard the counsel for the review petitioners as well as the State.

The present application seeks review of the judgment dated 11.07.2016 passed in L.P.A. No. 347 of 2015 whereby the appeal was dismissed. The writ petition filed by the review petitioners was also disposed of granting no relief to the petitioners.

Upon hearing the counsel for the review petitioners and the State, it appears to us the petitioners want this Court to re-hear the appeal. It is the contention that one of the grounds taken by the writ petitioners was not considered by the writ appeal court.

Considering the narrow confines of the jurisdiction and the sole ground as submitted by the review petitioners, we are not convinced that a case for review of the order is made out.

The application is rejected.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J.)

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

HR/-

AFR/NAFR	
U	

