

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Review No.482 of 2018

In

Letters Patent Appeal No.1560 of 2015

=====

M/s Patrons (India) Enterprises, a Partnership Firm, having its factory at C-20, Industrial Area, Patliputra, P.S. Patliputra, District – Patna through its partner, Birendra Gandhi.

... ... Appellant/Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna through its Chairman,
2. The Chief Engineer (Commercial), Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The General Manager cum-Chief Engineer, PESU, Strand Road, Patna.
4. The Electrical Superintendent Engineer, PESU, West, Mangles Road, Patna.

... ... Respondents/Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Priya Gupta, Advocate
Mr. Mohit Agrawal, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 09-01-2019 Heard Mrs. Priya Gupta, learned counsel for the applicant

and Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned Senior Counsel for the respondent

Bihar State Electricity Board.

The contention raised in this review application is that in view of liberty given to the applicant to file a review application at the time of initial dismissal of Special Leave Petition, this application deserves to be entertained.

We have perused the order passed by the Apex Court in the S.L.P. which has been dismissed clearly recording that the Court did not find any reason to interfere with the judgment of the High



Court and it is, thereafter, this review application has been preferred.

Thus, this review application is a post Apex Court review application seeking review of the judgment on the factual premise as stated in paragraph 21 and 22 of the review application.

Having perused the same, we are satisfied that the said assertion are in relation to inference of facts, which was not even the subject matter of consideration. Even the ground available cannot be said to be a ground for treating the review application nor do we find any error on the face of record. We, therefore, find no reason to entertain this review application. It is dismissed.

In our considered opinion, if the agreement in possession of the respondent contains the date of the commencement of the agreement, merely because the copy of the agreement of the applicant does not contain the date would not alter the status of the said agreement, unless the same is challenged before an appropriate forum.

(Amreshwar Pratap Sahi, CJ)

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

