

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.87 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8 of 2019

=====

Rakesh Kumar, S/o- Bhola Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Chukati, P.S.-
Mansi, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited through its
Chairman Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Sone
Bhawan, 5th Floor, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.
2. Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Sone
Bhawan, 5th Floor, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.
3. District Manager, State Food Corporation, Khagaria at Khagaria.
4. Principal Finance, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited,
Sone Bhawan, 5th Floor, Birchand Patel Path, Patna.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Binod Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

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

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

3 08-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the opposite parties.

2. By filing this application, the petitioner is seeking
review of the order dated 12.08.2022 passed by this Court in
CWJC No. 8 of 2019. The order dated 12.08.2022 passed in the
writ application reads as under:-

“The petitioner has prayed for the
following relief/s:-

That this writ application is being
filed on behalf of above named
petitioner for giving direction to



Respondents to refund the deducted amount of Rs.64,43,784/- which was deducted in account of load cell G.P.S. and deviation of way.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the petition reserving liberty to take appropriate action.

Permission granted.

The present petition stands disposed of as withdrawn with liberty aforesaid.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.”

3. Upon hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the opposite parties, we have noticed that in this case, the petitioner moved this Court in its writ jurisdiction for a direction to the Respondents-opposite parties to refund the deducted amount from the bills of the petitioner which he was claiming on account of the services rendered as Transport, Handing-cum-Delivery Agent for doorstep delivery.

4. In course of hearing of the writ application, learned counsel for the petitioner sought permission to withdraw the writ petition reserving liberty to take appropriate action and the said permission has been granted by the learned Writ Court.

5. In the nature of the reliefs prayed in the writ application, it is evident that the petitioner was granted liberty to



pursue his remedy and for that purpose only, the writ application was permitted to be withdrawn.

6. We find no merit in the review petition. It is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

lekhi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

