

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.544 of 2016

In

Second Appeal No.18 of 2014

=====

Ram Briksha Paswan, son of Late Babulal Paswan, resident of village Mirzapur, Post Office and Police Station Bahadurpur, District Darbhanga.

... .. Defendant/Respondent/Appellant/ Petitioner
Versus

1. Asha Devi, wife of Late Ram Sewak Jha.
2. Updesh Jha.
3. Chandra Bhushan Jha.
4. Ajit Kumar Jha. All are sons of Late Ram Sewak Jha. All resident of village and P.O. Deokuli, Police Station Bahadurpur, District Darbhanga.
5. Brij Bala Devi, wife of Krishna Ballabh Thakur and Daughter of Late Ram Sewak Jha, resident of village Devram, Police Station Bahera (Mirzapur) P.O. Benipur, District Darbhanga.

... ..Plaintiffs/Appellants/ Respondents/Opposite parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Bali Jha
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Brajesh Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

6 05-07-2018

I.A. No. 225 of 2017

Delay of 77 days in filing the present review application stands condoned, in view of the averments made in I.A.No. 225 of 2017, since the Court is of the opinion that the petitioner has been able to make out a case that the petitioner was prevented by sufficient cause from approaching this Court within the stipulated time.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner



concedes that it is difficult for him to make out a case of review of the judgment and order dated 31.08.2016, passed by this Court in Second Appeal No. 18 of 2014.

Learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, has started his submissions raising his grievance against the said judgment of this Court as if the Court could exercise the appellate jurisdiction on the present review application.

An application for review can not be entertained in the absence of well-established and well-recognized grounds for review. This Court, while dismissing Second Appeal No. 18 of 2014, by the said judgment and dated 31.08.2016, has specifically held that there was no substantial question of law arising for consideration in appeal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any apparent error on record in the judgment and order, under review

I do not find any merit in this application, which is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--

