

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CIVIL REVIEW No.523 of 2018**

**In**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16672 of 2018**

=====

Manish Kumar Son of Kamla Kant Singh resident of Paharma, Police Station-  
Osawan, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through its the Secretary Human Resources Development Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Vice Chancellor, Veer Kunwar Singh University, Ara.
3. The Registrar, Veer Kunwar Singh University Ara.
4. The President, Governing Body, Jagjivan College, Dehari-On-Sone, Rohtas.
5. The Secretary, Jagjivan College Dehari-On- Sone, Rohtas.
6. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dehari-On- Sone- Cum- Government Representative.
7. The University Representative, Governing Body, Jagjivan College Dehari-On- Sone, Rohtas.
8. The Teachers Representative, Member of Governing Body, Jagjivan College Dehari-On- Sone, Rohtas.
9. The Principal, Jagjivan College Dehari-On- Sone, Rohtas.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranvijay Narain Singh  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 27-03-2019**

1. The present petition has been filed for review of the order ***dated 10.10.2018*** passed in ***C.W.J.C. no. 16672 of 2018.***

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the present petition was sought to be withdrawn with liberty to approach the Bihar Aided Educational Institution Authority, Patna on account of mistake committed by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner at the time of hearing of the connected writ petition. It



is further submitted that as per the Bihar Aided Educational Institution Authority Rules, 2015, only service matters/ disputes pertaining to Colleges which impart education up to Intermediate level and are affiliated with any University, can be adjudicated by the aforesaid authority and the College in question does not fall within the purview of the aforesaid Rules, 2015.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and I find that the provision for review is enshrined under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure Code, 1908, according to which a review petition can be filed only in cases where the petitioner is not aware about some new and important facts/ evidence, at the time of passing of the judgment and the same has come to the knowledge of the petitioner subsequently. But this is not the case in the present matter and on the contrary, the learned counsel for the petitioner had consciously and voluntarily withdrawn the writ petition with liberty to approach the aforesaid authority. Hence, I do not find any reason to entertain the present petition, as such, the review petition is dismissed, however liberty is granted to the petitioner to file a fresh writ petition, if so advised.

**(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)**

rinkee/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | NA         |
| Uploading Date    | 03.04.2019 |
| Transmission Date | NA         |

