

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.128 of 2019

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8419 of 2016

=====

Harendra Prasad Singh Son of late Jang Bahadur Prasad Singh Resident of
Village Maur, Police station Barbigha, District Sheikhpura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department, Government of Bihar,
Patna.
3. The Director, Agriculture, Agriculture Department, Government of Bihar,
Patna.
4. The Joint Director, Patna Division, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Patna.
6. The District Agriculture Officer, Patna.
7. The State of Jharkhand through the Principal Secretary, Department of
Agriculture, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi.
8. The District Agriculture Officer, Dumka, Jharkhand.
9. The District Agriculture Officer Sahebganj, Jharkhand.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjay Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG-13
		Mrs. Sunita Kumari, AC to AAG-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 24-04-2025 Heard Mr. Sanjay Kumar Verma, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mrs. Sunita Kumari, learned AC to AAG-13.

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

(i) to review of the order dated 20.6.2016
dismissing the writ application C.W.J.C.



No. 8419 of 2016 passed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Kumar Tripathi (as his Lordship then was) presumably because of some communication gap or otherwise error apparent on the face of record as crept in the order dated 20.06.2016 causing miscarriage of justice requiring recommendation even EX DEBITO JUSTITIA as Hon'ble Single Judge was pleased to agree with the objection raised on behalf of the State of Jharkhand as regard the maintainability of the writ petition before this Hon'ble Court and accordingly dismissed the writ application with the observation that let the petitioner move the jurisdiction of the authorities of State of Jharkhand or the Jharkhand High Court if so desires.

3. The writ Court considering claims of the petitioner rightly observed that grievance that the petitioner has, he should move before the appropriate authority or the Jharkhand High Court.



4. Instead, the petitioner chose to file review petition.

5. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted liberty to approach the appropriate authority/Jharkhand High Court as per observation of the writ Court in C.W.J.C. No. 8419 of 2016 (Harendra Prasad Singh Vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.) disposed of on 20.06.2016.

6. Granting said liberty, the review petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

