

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CIVIL REVIEW No.386 of 2019**

**In**  
**Letters Patent Appeal No.60 of 2016**

=====

Ram Shankar Chaudhary Son of Late Raghurib Chaudhary Resident of Village and Post at Majhulia, Bisaipatti, Ward No.-6, P.S.- Rameshwar Nagar, Near Ashok Paper Mills, Via- Laheria Sarai, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Bank of India through Chief Manager, Darbhanga City, Post and District- Darbhanga.
2. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India Darbhanga City, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                    |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr.Shashi Nath Jha, Advocate       |
|                            |   | Mr.Purushottam, Advocate           |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr.Sri Sunil Kumar Singh, Advocate |
| For the Respondent/SBI :   |   | Ms.Namrata Mishra, Advocate        |
|                            |   | Ms.Archana Jha, Advocate           |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI**  
**and**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

**(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)**

4      06-08-2024

**Re:- I.A. No. 01 of 2020**

Heard I.A. No. 01 of 2020 for condonation of delay in filing C. Rev. No. 386 of 2019. There is delay of about two years five months and seven days. Sufficient cause has not been shown. Reason assigned is that advocate on record who was pursuing L.P.A. No. 60 of 2016 and so also writ petition has not apprised review petitioner *Ram Shankar Chaudhary* about day to day affairs of the aforementioned cases. Therefore, delay of about two years five months and seven days is required to be



condoned. Such enormous delay cannot be condoned to adjudicate Civil Review. Even scope of Civil Review is limited under Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C. to the extent of what is error apparent on the face of the record. If the review petitioner's counsel fails to appear in L.P.A. No. 60 of 2016 that may not be the ground for review. In other words, it will not fall under error apparent on the face of the record.

2. Accordingly, I.A. No. 01 of 2020 stands dismissed, resultantly, L.P.A. No. 60 of 2016 stands dismissed.

3. Pending I.A.s, if any, stands disposed of.

**(P. B. Bajanthri, J)**

**(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)**

alok/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

