

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.485 of 2017

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 6897 of 2016

=====

Lalan Kumar Singh

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar & Ors

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey (Aag 15)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA**

ORAL ORDER

3 14-03-2018 Heard the parties.

Petitioner has preferred this Review Petition for review of order dated 10.08.2017 passed by this Court in CWJC No. 6897 of 2016 by which and whereunder this Court disposed of the above stated writ petition directing the concerned officials to ensure payment of retrial dues of opposite party no. 7 in accordance with law and furthermore, this Court also observed in the aforesaid order that if the concerned authorities came to the conclusion that opposite party no. 7 of this petition is not found entitle for any retrial dues, the concerned authorities shall pass reasoned order denying his claim.

The petitioner wants review of the aforesaid order on the ground that opposite party no. 7 suppressed some material facts regarding pendency of criminal case and got the aforesaid order.



Learned counsels submits that as a matter of fact, it was placed before this Court at the time of passing order dated 10.08.2017 in CWJC No. 6897 of 2016 that the police had already submitted final form showing mistake of fact in Bahadurpur P.S. Case No.161 of 2012 but as a matter of fact, the aforesaid case was ordered to be re-investigated by the concerned Magistrate on the prayer of investigating officer and the aforesaid fact was suppressed by the opposite party no. 7 but in my view, there was no suppression by opposite party no. 7 because it was only argued that the police after investigation submitted final form in Bahadurpur P.S. Case No.161 of 2012 and the aforesaid final form was accepted by the court.

No doubt, subsequently, the concerned Magistrate granted permission to investigating officer to re-investigate the aforesaid case but admittedly, prior to that order, final form had already been accepted by the concerned court. Moreover, petitioner is not related with grant of pension of the opposite party no. 7 and he was not party to writ petition. It appears to me that he has filed this review petition out of personal vendetta.

Accordingly, I do not find any ground to review my previous order dated 10.08.2017 passed in CWJC No. 6897 of 2016 and accordingly, this review petition stands dismissed on



admission stage itself.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

N.K/-

U			
---	--	--	--

