

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1557 of 2024
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9622 of 2022

M/s Peerage Industries Pvt. Ltd. (Erstwhile Known as M/s Peerage Buildtech Pvt. Ltd.) a company registered under the Company Act having its registered office at 42A/1, Hemkunt Colony, Greater Kailash-1, New Delhi through its authorized signatory Devendra Kumar (Male) aged about 53 years, S/o Late Dinanath Sharma, resident of Gram Kothiyan, Gaini, Aurangabad, Bihar-824113.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Industries cum Chairman Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority (BIADA), Patna, Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Industries cum Chairman, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority (BIADA), Patna, Bihar.
3. The Deputy Secretary, Department of Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority (BIADA) Udyog Bhawan, Gandhi Maidan, Patna through its Managing Director.
5. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority (BIADA), Udyog Bhawan, Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
6. The Executive Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority (BIADA), Regional Office, Hajipur, Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Saurabh Suman Sinha, Advocate Mr. Sriram Krishna, Advocate Mr. Brisketu haran Pandey, Advocate Mr. Amarjeet, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Subhash Pd. Singh, GA-3
For the BIADA	:	Mrs. Binita Singh, Advocate



CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 14-05-2024

The petitioner has filed an application for recall of the judgment in the writ petition, which was dismissed along with an appeal; the subject matter of both of which was an industrial plot belonging to the BIADA. We are unable to find any power to recall our order or such a remedy being available to the petitioner.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a review is not filed since admittedly, some documents were not filed because of the lawyer's fault.

3. We find absolutely no jurisdiction to recall the order and whether it be by the lawyer's default or the parties default, if the documents were not produced, then it would not be a case for review also, since the petitioner admittedly does not have a case that despite due diligence the petitioner could not produce or trace out the documents at the time of hearing. The petitioner concedes there is no case for review then there is no case to recall our judgment.



4. We reject the application as one
misconceived.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Sujit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	14.05.2024
Transmission Date	

