

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.94 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12676 of 2022

Dayanand Anglo Vaidic Public School, Jehanabad, Through the Principal Krishna Kant Pandey (Male), aged about 50 years, son of Late Satyavrat Pandey, at present working as principal DAV Public School, Jehanabad, P.S. - Jehanabad, District - Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Sate Of Bihar Through the Chief Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reform, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Gaya Division, Gaya.
4. The District Magistrate, Jehanabad.
5. The Circle Officer, Jehanabad
6. The Secretary, Central Board of Secondary Education, Shiksha Kendra 2 Community Centre, Preet Vihar, Delhi- 110092.
7. Yogendra Paswan S/o Sita Ram Paswan Resident of Village- Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.
8. Ram Pravesh Paswan S/o Sidhewar Paswan Resident of Khajachi Hatt, P.S.Sadar, District- Purnea at presently resident of village-Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.
9. Ram Bishun Paswan S/o Late Badeshi Paswan Resident of Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.
10. Shambhu Sharan Singh S/o Late Ram Sharan Singh Resident of Village-Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.
11. Sita Ram Paswan S/o Late Ram Narayan Paswan Resident of Village-Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.
12. Shankar Raj S/o Ashok Paswan Resident of Village- Dhangawa, P.S. and District- Jehanabad.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party-State	:	Mr. Akash Raj, AC to GA-5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY



ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

Date : 11-12-2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AC to GA-5 for the State.

2. This application has been filed seeking review of the judgment dated 02.09.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 12676 of 2022, whereby and whereunder the writ application was disposed of granting the liberty to the petitioner to take recourse to such remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the judgment under review was passed without any notice to the present petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that on bare perusal of the judgment under review it would be found that the Hon'ble Division Bench has not entertained the writ application as a Public Interest Litigation and it has been clearly opined in the judgment under review that the petition is in the nature of Private Interest Litigation and not Public Interest Litigation in as much as dispute between the private parties stands highlighted. The Division Bench, therefore, refrained from issuing any notice.



5. Learned counsel for the State submits that in fact in the judgment under review no mandamus has been issued to the respondents. In no way the judgment reflects on the merit of the contention of the private respondents. All that is said is that the writ petitioners are at liberty to take recourse to such remedies which may be available in accordance with law. It is pointed out that the Hon'ble Division Bench has specifically recorded in the operative part of its judgment that they have not expressed any opinion on merit and all issues have been left open.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the judgment under review the writ petitioner filed an application under the Bihar Public Land Encroachment Act wherein an order has been passed against the present petitioner. The said order is under challenge in C.W.J.C. No. 3378 of 2024.

7. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and learned counsel for the State as also on perusal of the judgment under review, we find substance in the submissions of learned counsel for the State. The judgment under review does not reflect on the merit of the case and we do not find that it has any adverse effect on the case of the review-



petitioner.

8. In such circumstance, this Court finds no reason to review the judgment under review.

9. This application stands disposed off accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/krishna-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12.12.2025
Transmission Date	NA

