

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.325 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13720 of 2014

=====

Satish Chandra Jha Son of Late Jagdish Jha, resident of Village- Marwa, P.S.- Musrigharari, District Samastipur at present working as Incharge Head Master of Khudneshwar Ranjiti Sanskrit Prathmik- Sah- Madhya Vidyalaya, Morwa, District- Samstipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Chairman, Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna.
4. Krishna Mohan Mishra, Son of Satya Narayan Mishra, Resident of Village- Lat Basepura, P.S.- Musrigharari District- Samastipur Rajniti claiming to be Heasmaster in Khudneshwar Rajniti Sanskrit Prathmik Sah Madhya Vidyalaya, Morwa, Samstipur.
5. Ranju Kumari, Claiming to be Assistant Teacher, Daughter of Late Yamuna Prasad Thakur, Resident of Village- Ratanpur, District- Darbhanga.
6. Sanjeev Kumar Pathak, Claiming to be Assistant Teacher, Son of Sri Satya Narayan Pathak, Resident of Village- Lagunia Raghuvanth, P.S. and District- Samastipur.
7. Subhash Chandra Jha, Claiming to be Assistant Teacher, Son of Kameshwa Jha, Resident of Village- Morwadih, P.O. Morwa, P.S. Musrigharari, District- Samastipur.
8. Shatrughna Prasad, Claiming to be Assistant Teacher, Son of Sri Ramdeo Prasad, Resident of Village- Goshaighat Gali, Guljarbagh, District- Patna.
9. Sanjay Kumar Jha, Claiming to be Peon, Son of Late Bhairav Jha, Resident of Village- Morwadih, P.O. Morwa, P.S. Musrigharari, District- Samastipur.
10. Balram Prasad, the retired Special Director, Secondary Education, Vikas Bhawan, Patna.
11. Girindra Mohan Mishra, Headmaster, Gandhi Sanskrit Vidyalaya, Kamla Samstipur, Claiming to be Secre

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Durga Nand Jha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashutosh Ranjan Pandey, AAG 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

10 22-12-2022

1. The petitioner by way of this review petition has



prayed for seeking review of an order passed by the High Court dated 12.07.2018, whereby the matter was remanded back to the Appellate Authority for hearing it afresh in accordance with law.

2. The petitioner has filed this review petition on the ground that they were already parties before in the appeal and therefore, there was no occasion to remand the matter back without hearing the petitioners. Counsel for the petitioners could not appear on the said date when the case was decided.

3. I have considered the submission and find that the remand of the case to the Appellate Authority does not warrant any interference as both the writ petitioner as well as the present applicants are already parties to the appeal and they can all be heard afresh before the Appellate Authority who would examine the case on merits after considering their respective pleadings.

4. The review petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Suraj/-
Item No. 120

U			
---	--	--	--

