

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No. 69 of 2014

Arising out of
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 18607 of 2011

-
-
1. The State of Bihar
 2. The Principal Secretary, Department of General Administration, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
 3. The Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
 4. The District Establishment Committee, Aurangabad through its Chairman.
 5. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
 6. The Civil Surgeon cum Chief Medical Officer, Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Arun Prasad, Son of Ram Kishore Prasad Resident of Village - Araura, P.S. - Deo, District - Aurangabad, at present posted as clerk P.H.C. Sadar Block Aurangabad.
2. Imteyaz Alam, Son of Late Md. Nizammuddin Resident of Village - Khiriawan, P.S. - Madanpur, District - Aurangabad, Clerk P.H.C. Madan Pur, Aurangabad.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar, AC to AG
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN
AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 24-01-2020

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. The present application has been filed seeking review of order dated 08.12.2011 passed in CWJC No. 18607 of 2011, which was disposed off in similar terms to order dated 14.02.2011 passed in CWJC No. 10922 of 2006.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the order dated 14.02.2011 passed in CWJC No. 10922 of 2006, was taken before the Appellate Court by the petitioners in LPA No.



1001 of 2012, which was dismissed by order dated 11.04.2013. It was submitted that the petitioners thereafter approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) CC No. 19850 of 2013. Learned counsel submitted that notice has been issued in the aforesaid case by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the order of the writ Court has been stayed.

4. On a specific query of the Court as to whether the case of the petitioners was different from that of Deepak Kumar Pathak and Others of CWJC No. 10922 of 2006, learned counsel did not controvert the same.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the Court finds that the present review application is misconceived. What has happened subsequently at the Appellate stage in the other case may be a ground to file appeal against the order under review, but such will not be a ground for reviewing the order.

6. In view thereof, the application stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to take appropriate steps, in accordance with law.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

