

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.129 of 2022

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1495 of 2013

=====

Uday Kumar, son of Arjun Prasad Singh, resident of House No. 39, Village-
Chero, P.O. Chero, P.S. Sarmera, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
4. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), District- Nalanda.
5. The District Education Officer, Nalanda.
6. The Block Development Officer, Sarmera, District- Nalanda.
7. The Block Education Parsar Officer, Sarmera Block, District- Nalanda.
8. Smt. Milawa Devi at present Mukhiya Chero Panchayat, resident of Village- Chero, P.S. Sarmera, District- Nalanda.
9. The Panchayat Secretary, Chero Gram Panchayat, P.S. Sarmera, District- Nalanda.
10. Sri Parmanand Sinha (the then Counseling Member) at present Head Master, High School Sarmera, P.S. Sarmera, District- Nalanda.
11. Chandra Bhanu Singh, son of Parmanand Sinha at present Primary Panchayat Teacher Upgraded Middle School Birindawan, P.S. Sarmera, District- Nalanda.

... .. Opposite Parties.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Vinay Prasad Singh, AC to GA-XII.
For the Private Respondent:		Mr. Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate.
		Mr. Prabhojot Singh, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

Date : 04-02-2025

I.A. No.1 of 2023:

Heard I.A. No.1 of 2023 for condonation of a delay of



about 3 years and 20 days in filing the present Civil Review No.129 of 2022 insofar as reviewing the order dated 15.05.2017 passed in L.P.A. No.1495 of 2013.

2. The reasons assigned for condonation of delay of about 3 years and 20 days are stated in paragraphs-2 to 5 of I.A. No.1 of 2023. Paragraphs 2 to 5 of I.A. No.1 of 2023 are read as under:

- “(2) That it is submitted that the counsel of the appellant/petitioner not informed to the petitioner regarding result of L.P.A. No.1495 of 2013 till March 2020 thereafter Lockdown petitioner/appellant enquired the instant case the then he know L.P.A. No.1495/2013 already dismissed on 15.05.2017.
- (3) That it is submitted that thereafter the petitioner to advise of another advocate and who advised to him to file present civil review petition.
- (4) That it is submitted that then the petitioner is a poor man and not arranged money after advice of another advocate.
- (5) That it is humbly submitted that appellant/petitioner arranged money of other sources and contract with present counsel.

In this regard it is submitted that the



petitioner/ appellant is unemployed man and as such in arranging money he took some time and as such he could not file the instant civil review petition within stipulated time.”

3. The aforementioned reasons are not sufficient to condone the enormous delay of about 3 years and 20 days. Resultantly, review petitioner has not made out a case for condonation of delay of about 3 years and 20 days in filing the present Civil Review No.129 of 2022 and I.A. No.1 of 2023 stands dismissed.

Civil Review No.129 of 2022:

4. Resultantly, Civil Review No.129 of 2022 stands dismissed.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

P.S./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	07.02.2025.
Transmission Date	NA

