

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CIVIL REVIEW No.213 of 2019

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9860 of 2013

=====

Bimlendra Kumar Thakur, aged about 64 years, male, Son of Late Satya Narayan Thakur, Resident of Village and P.O.- Chainpur, P.S.- Bangaon, District- Saharsa Assistant Teacher, Neelkanth Girls' Middle School, Chainpur, Anchal- Kahra, District- Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Primary Education, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Regional Deputy Director of (Education), Koshi Division, Saharsa.
5. The District Education Officer, Saharsa.
6. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Saharsa.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Suraj Kumar, Adv.

For the State : Mr. Shashi Shekhar Tiwary, AC to AAG-15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 05-07-2024



Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has prayed for review of the order dated 12.10.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 9860 of 2013 (*Bimlendra Kumar Thakur Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.*), primarily on the ground that under similar circumstances, relief has been granted to the applicants therein.

3. We are afraid that this cannot be a ground for reviewing an order which was passed on 12.10.2018.

4. To be more specific, it was urged on behalf of the petitioner that the order contained in Memo No. 279 dated 04.02.2013 issued by the respondent/District Programme Officer (Estb.), Saharsa, whereby the petitioner was made to retire from service with effect from 31.01.2013, be set aside on the ground that he had entered into service at the age of 18 years with a private employee. It was found that the petitioner had entered into an employment with a private party where his date of birth was shown as 18 years.



Finding that the contention of the petitioner was not correct with respect to his age, the petition was dismissed.

5. That some other persons with similar facts were granted the relief, as we have noted above, is no ground for entertaining this review petition.

6. The petition is merit less and is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	08/07/2024
Transmission Date	N/A

