

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.581 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9759 of 2016

=====

Siya Devi wife of Dashrath Pra. Yadav @ Dashrath Prasad Yadav, resident of village-Kanchangarh, P.O. Baka, P.S. Muffasil, District-Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. The Commissioner, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, B.M.P. Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General of Police, B.M.P. Bihar, Patna.
5. The Director Provident, Provident Fund, Bihar, Patna.
6. The State of Jharkhand.
7. The Director General of Police, Jharkhand at Ranchi.
8. The I.G. of Police (B.M.P.) Jharkhand at Ranchi.
9. The Commandant, Jharkhand Police Force-4, Bokaro.
10. The Director, Provident Fund, Jharkhand at Ranchi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Parmatma Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Prabhat Kumar Verma Aag 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. NILU AGRAWAL
ORAL ORDER

3 08-04-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Petitioner seeks review of the order dated 07.07.2017 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 9759 of 2016 on the ground that it was observed while disposing of the writ application that all dues and claims of the petitioner have been settled, which is emerging from the pleadings filed on behalf of the respondents. Accordingly, the writ application was disposed of.

3. Against the said order passed in the writ application, the petitioner preferred LPA No. 1160 of 2017, which was also dismissed on 04.10.2018 on the ground that if



the original writ petitioner had any grievance that there was no full and final settlement of the dues and claims of the petitioner, the writ petitioner ought to have raised the said fact and ought not to have got his case disposed of.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in view of the observation of the Division Bench while dismissing the appeal that remedies lies elsewhere and since all dues and claims had not been settled as GPF with up-to-date interest has not yet been paid, the order passed in the writ application is sought to be reviewed.

5. This review application cannot be entertained because of the limited scope of review and the fact that the petitioner is virtually seeking a rehearing of the writ application on merit.

6. No case of review is made out. Review application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Nilu Agrawal, J)

Rajesh/devendra/
priyanka

U			
---	--	--	--

