

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.18 of 2020

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1470 of 2017

=====

Agamlal Paswan son of Late Sayam Sunder Paswan, Resident of Village-
Dhaneshri, P.O.- Mangaphar Charia, P.S.- Bharganwan, Distt.- Araria.

... .. Petitioner-Appellant

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through its principal Secretary, Department of Home (Police) Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate cum Collector Araria District - Araria.
3. The Deputy Collector, In- Charge, District General Section, Araria.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Araria, District - Araria.
5. The Subdivisional Police Officer of Farbisganj Sub Division, District - Araria.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer of Farbisganj Sub - Division, District - Araria.
7. The Circle Officer, Bhargawan Circle, District - Araria.
8. Officer In-charge Bhargawan Police Station, District - Araria.
9. Block Development Officer, Bhargawan, Araria.

... .. Respondents-Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rana Ishwar Chandra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Verma (Aag 3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI)

4 17-01-2025 Heard Mr. Rana Ishwar Chandra, learned Advocate

for the petitioner and Mr. Prabhat Kumar Verma, learned AAG-3

for the Respondent.

2. The present Review Application has been filed by

the applicant-original petitioner/appellant with a prayer that

order dated 05.12.2019 passed by Division Bench of this Court

in Letters Patent Appeal No. 1470 of 2017 (in Civil Writ



Jurisdiction Case No. 9144 of 2014) be reviewed on the ground mentioned in the memo of the application. Learned Advocate for the applicant has referred to the averments made in the present application. It is submitted that the learned Single Judge as well as the Division Bench of this Court have not considered the factual aspects of the matter and rejected the claim of the present applicant/original petitioner mainly on the ground that the Collector is not empowered to correct the date of birth of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the learned Single Judge has also committed an error by observing that the applicant filed representation after a period of fifteen years. It has been further contended that the applicant has joined the service in the year 1990 and thereafter made the representation for correction of date of birth in the year 2000 i.e., after a period of ten years. However, the said aspect has also not been dealt with by the learned Single Judge as well as the Division Bench while passing the order in question. Learned Advocate, therefore, urged that the present application be allowed and thereby the order dated 05.12.2019 passed by Division Bench of this Court in the aforesaid appeal be reviewed.

3. We have considered the submissions canvassed by learned Advocates appearing for the parties. We have also



perused the materials placed on record. We are of the view that learned Advocate has tried to re-argue the case of the applicant-appellant on merits which is not permissible. The applicant has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record. We have gone through the order passed by Division Bench on 05.12.2019 in Letters Patent Appeal No. 1470 of 2017. We cannot re-examine the case of the applicant again once the Division Bench has already considered the submissions canvassed by learned Advocate for the applicant.

4. As the applicant has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record, we are not inclined to entertain the present application.

5. Accordingly, Civil Review Application No. 18 of 2020 stands dismissed.

(Vipul M. Pancholi, J)

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

GKS/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

