

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.184 of 2021

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.378 of 2018

=====

Anju Devi W/o Sri Arun Kumar, Resident of Village and P.O.- Beur, Police
Station- Chainpur, District- Kaimur.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary Welfare department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director Integrated Child Development Scheme Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabua.
4. The District Programme Officer, Kaimur at Bhabua.
5. The Child Development Project Officer, Chainpur, District- Bhabua.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA- 7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

3 29-11-2024

I.A. No. 1 of 2024

This interlocutory application has been filed seeking
condonation of delay of 1 year 8 months and 28 days in filing of
the review application.

2. In this case, the petitioner whose engagement as an
'*Anganbari Sevika*' has been terminated lost her fight against the
said termination before all the authorities, the learned Writ
Court and finally in the Letters Patent Appeal before this Court.
The order of which review has been sought for was passed as



back as on 23.04.2018 in Letters Patent Appeal No. 378 of 2018. The order was passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court after hearing learned counsel for the appellant.

3. In her application seeking condonation of delay, the petitioner has made a bald statement that after the order dated 23.04.2018, the petitioner was not informed about the status of the case, thereafter, the petitioner contacted her learned counsel but due to some reasons or others, she could not get proper information.

4. Further statements have been made that after Covid-19 pandemic, she came to Patna and obtained the certified copy of the order on 22.11.2021 and thereafter, she took steps to file review application.

5. We find that the reasons shown for condonation of the huge delay of 1 year 8 months and 22 days are neither cogent nor sufficient reasons to condone the delay. The statements made in paragraphs '2' and '3' of the application are only tentative kind of statements without there being any clarity and such statement should not inspire confidence of this Court.

6. This interlocutory application seeking condonation of delay is, hence, liable to be rejected and the same stands rejected.



7. I.A. No. 1 of 2024 stands dismissed.

8. As a result of rejection of the interlocutory application seeking condonation of delay, this review application stands dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

