

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.98 of 2023

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22448 of 2011

=====

Satyendra Kumar Mishra @ Satyendra Mishra Son of Late Hari Narayan Mishra Resident of Village-Rauja, Police Station-Chapra Town, District-Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Commissioner-Cum-Secretary Department of Construction of National Highway, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chief Engineer (Mech.) National Highway Construction, Mechanical Division, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Special Secretary, Road Construction Department, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Executive Engineer Mechanical Division, Dehri-on-Son.
5. The Superintendent Engineer (Mechanical), National High Way, Mechanical Circle, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Choudhary Shyam Nandan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ravi Bhardwaj, AC to GA-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 31-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the following relief/s:

*(i) for review of the order dated 23.02.2023
passed in C.W.J.C. No. 22448 of 2011
passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madhuresh Prasad(as his Lordship then was).*

3. The petitioner preferred writ petition for a direction upon the respondent to take decision on his representation dated



22.07.2011 by which he had made a prayer for his regularization.

4. The matter was taken up by the writ court and it took note of the fact that memo no. 694 dated 23.10.1998 by which the services of the petitioner was already brought to an end having found that they were working irregularly and without following the procedure necessary for the government appointment.

5. Further taking note of an order of the earlier writ court dated 25.08.2010 in **C.W.J.C. No. 6969 of 2005 (Abhimanya Thakur & Ors. vs. the State of Bihar & ors)**, learned Judge came to the conclusion that the petitioner has moved before this Court only in the year 2011, in that background, no direction for regularization can be issued, the writ petition was dismissed.

6. Aggrieved, the present review petition.

7. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner tried to impress upon this Court that some others were granted relief, he was left out, learned State counsel rightly pointed out that the petitioner is/was of the fence sitter who despite being out of job in 1998, moved before this Court for disposal of his representation in the year 2011 after the order was passed in



the year 1998, in that background, the writ court took the right stand in dismissing the petition.

8. Having gone through the facts of the case as also the materials on record and the counter affidavit filed before the writ court, this Court do not find any error in the order of the writ court.

10. It is time for the petitioner to seek other avenues as lots of water has flown down the Ganges since the year 1998. He should instead go for the self employment, if still is unemployed as there are number of such schemes available under the Government of India/Government of Bihar where promoting self employment, loans are being made available to a person according to the skill of an individual.

11. So far as the review petitioner is concerned, it is bereft of merit, dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

