

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CIVIL REVIEW No.19 of 2018**

**In**  
**Letters Patent Appeal No.854 of 2016**

=====

M/s Bihar Metal Casting Corporation, B-1, Phase-1 Industrial Ara, Fatuha-803201 through it's proprietor deceased Rajeshwar Prasad son of Late Dukhi Prasad, represented through his son Brijnandan Prasad, Son of Late Rajeshwar Prasad sonof Late Rajeshwar Prasad, resident of Village- Ahiapur, P.O.- Gopalbad, Police Station- Sarmera, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Managing Director, Bihar State Financial Corporation, Frazer Road, Patna- 800001.
3. The Manager Accounts Zon- V, Bihar State Financial Corporation, Frazer Road, Patna- 800001.
4. The Branch Manager, Bihar State Financial Corporation, Industrial Area, Fatuha- 803201.
5. The Development Officer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority BIADA First Floor, Industry Bhawan East Gandhi Maidan, Patna
6. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Development Authority, First Floor, Industry Bhawan East Gandhi Maidan, Patna
7. M/s Raj Lakshmi Udhog (the then Possession)B-1 Industrial Area, Fatuha through Proprietor Shri Ramesh Singh, Pahlezaghat, Sonepur Chapra, Bihar
8. M/s Shubhan Enterprises Pvt. Ltd. Through it's proprietor, Anil Kumar, NH-30, Villager- Hidayat P.O.- Manjhauli, P.S.- Bakhtiyarpur, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Chandra Shekher Prasad, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Devesh Shankar, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**

**ORAL ORDER**

**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

4      26-06-2019                      Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

This review application has been filed for review of  
the order dated 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2017 passed in L.P.A. No. 854 of  
2016 where certain arguments have been advanced.



We have gone through the grounds taken but we are unable to locate any error apparent from the face of record so as to invoke our review jurisdiction either on any description of facts or the findings recorded on the issues raised in the appeal.

Learned counsel has urged that as a matter of fact the respondents have proceeded to auction the assets in an arbitrary manner without there being any proper procedure being followed and to the complete disadvantage of the applicant.

This aspect of merit about the procedure having been followed has been explicitly dealt with in paragraph 9 and 13 of the impugned judgment.

We do not find any such grounds so as to entertain this review application.

It is dismissed accordingly.

**(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)**

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

avin/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

