

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.483 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6384 of 2016

=====

Shailendra Kumar Son of Sri Kapildeo Singh, Resident of Quarter No. A/21,
MIT Campus, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Brahampura, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Science and Technology Department, Government of Bihar, Technology Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Director, Science and Technology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Assistant Director (Administration), Science and Technology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Member Secretary, Department Grievance Redressal Committee, Science and Technology Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Principal Secretary, Muzaffarpur, Institute of Technology, Muzaffarpur-840023.
7. The Secretary, All India Council for Technical Education, a Statutory body of the Government of India, New Delhi.
8. The Joint Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajesh Kumar, Advocate Mr. Lakshmi Kant Sharma, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Sanjeet Kumar Singh, AC to AAG-6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

5 24-04-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) for review of order dated 08.08.2016
passed in CWJC No. 6384 of 2016 by
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Kumar Tripathi (as
his Lordship then was) whereby the Hon'ble
Court was pleased to notice the fact that*



matter related to the issue in the writ petition is pending before Apex Court and further held that petitioner re-agitate the issue after disposal of case pending before Hon'ble Apex Court and further noticed that grant of ACP is pending for consideration or respondent authority will show their willingness to consider the case of grant of ACP and on that directed the petitioner for submitting representation for grant of ACP/MACP but both the facts are contrary to record. Thus, order passed by Hon'ble Court may require to be reviewed as having certain factually nonexistent fact.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner after some argument prays for withdrawal of the petition.

4. The same is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

