

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.188 of 2015

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 15763 of 2010

=====

1. Binod Kumar Son of Late Kamaldeo Prasad,
2. Krishna Prasad @ Jham Sahu @ Jham, Son of Mannu Ram, All resident
of Mohalla - Chhotaki Delha, P.s. - Delha, District - Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Sidheshwari Kumar Singh @ Sidheshwari Prasad Singh Son of Late Din
Dayal Ram, Resident of Mohalla - Chhotaki Delha, P.S. - Delha, District -
Gaya.
2. The State of Bihar.
3. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sadar, Gaya.
5. The Land Reforms, Deputy Collector, Gaya.
6. The Circle Officer, Town District - Gaya.
7. The Survey Superintendent Municipal Corporation White House Area,
Gaya.
8. Manoj Kumar Yadav, Son of Shyam Lal Yadav, resident of Mohalla -
Chhotaki Delha, P.S. - Delha, District - Gaya.
9. Shankar Tiwari, Son of Krishna Tiwari (Since dead)
10. Santosh Kumar Sinha, Son of Sri Baban Prasad (Since Dead)

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ganpati Trivedi, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Nagendra Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raghwanand, G.A.11
Mr. Rajan, A.C. to G.A.-11
Mr. Anjani Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Jitendra Kishore Verma, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

8 10-01-2018 This petition has been filed by the petitioners, who were

respondent nos.7 and 11 in the writ petition for review of the order

dated 14.07.2015 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 15763 of 2010 whereby

after hearing the parties, the impugned order dated 23.02.2010

passed by the Superintendent of Survey, Gaya in Appeal No. 2004



of 2002 by which he had set aside the order dated 24.10.2000 passed in Objection Case No. 561 of 1999 and had directed for preparation of record of right for Municipal plot nos. 1780, 1781 and 1782 in the name of State of Bihar with the nature of land as “temple-cum-Sahan” and for recording illegal possession of the petitioner over Sikmi Part “K” area 0075 acres of) Plot No.1780 has been set aside.

Mr. Ganpati Trivedi, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioners submitted that the order has been passed by the writ Court on misrepresentation of facts by the petitioner. In this regard, he has tried to draw my attention towards several documents filed in the present review petition, which were not even part of the writ petition.

In the opinion of this Court, review is not a routine procedure. Review of a judgment is a serious step and the consistent view of the Supreme Court is that only in case of glaring omission or patent mistake or vague error, the Court may review an order.

In the present case, no error apparent on the face of the record could be pointed out by the petitioners. In case the petitioners are aggrieved by the order, they may challenge the same by way of appeal, but in the considered opinion of this



Court, on reconsideration of merit, review petition cannot be allowed.

In that view of the matter, the application is dismissed.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Pradeep/-

U			
---	--	--	--

