

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.385 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10239 of 2014

=====

Surendra Prasad Son of Sadhu Prasad Resident of Dumduma, P.S.-Daudpur,
District-Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Human Resources, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Primary education, Bihar, Patna
3. The Regional Deputy Director of Education, saran Division, Saran
4. The District Education Officer, Saran
5. The District Programme Officer, Primary Education, Saran
6. The Block Education Extension Officer, Garkha, Saran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nagendra Prasad Yadav No 1, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prabhat Ranjan Singh, A.C. to A.A.G. 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

7 10-07-2019 The present review application is filed by the

petitioner for review of order of this Court in C.W.J.C. No.

10239 of 2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner places reliance on
the document contained in Annexure R/3. With regard to the
issues in question, opposite parties have filed supplementary
counter affidavit. In other cases also the same stand was taken
that the letter dated 13.09.2006 they did not find enclosure
showing the institution wherefrom petitioner has obtained
teachers training as recognized. In the present application, stand



has been taken in the counter affidavit that the institute was never recognized and has been mentioned in the paragraph 10 that the file number has not been indicated in the so called letter dated 13.09.2006. The font of the second page of the letter dated 13.09.2006 is completely different (para 11 of supplementary counter affidavit). It is to be kept in mind that while deciding the writ application, this Court has taken into consideration the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner was condemned unheard. This Court has placed reliance on the judgment of Canara Bank Vs. V.K. Awasthi reported in 2005 (6) SCC 321 and held out that no amount of opportunity would improve the case of the petitioner. The Court relied on the judgment in L.P.A. No. 1712 of 2012 and held out that the writ petition does not merit any consideration. Now by way of the present application the petitioner wants second round of hearing which is not permissible.

Considering the aforesaid, the Court does not find any merit in the review application and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

uma/-

U			
---	--	--	--

