

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.266 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22319 of 2019

Narendra Kumar Singh Son of Girja Singh, Resident of Village Shayam
Nagar Nima, P.O. and P.S.- Sherghati, District Gaya, Bihar- 824211.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Education, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, New Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Director, Higher Education, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, New Secretariat, Patna.
4. The Pay Verification Cell of Government of Bihar, through its In-charge, Text Books Corporation Building, Buddha Marg, Patna.
5. The Magadh University, through its Registrar, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
6. The Vice Chancellor, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
7. The Registrar, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
8. The Finance Officer, Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
9. The Finance Adviser Magadh University, Bodh Gaya, Gaya.
10. The Principal, A.N. College, Gaya.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Shashank Shekhar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Government Pleader 17
For the University	:	Mr. Md Faiz Ahmad, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 19-12-2025 Heard the parties concerned.

2. The scope of review is already settled wherein it has been said that it cannot be an appeal in disguise whereby fundamental distinction between review proceedings and appellate jurisdiction has been classified in order to check the misuse of jurisdiction by invoking the powers for re-opening the concluded issues under the garb of review.

3. From perusal of the records, it is quite apparent



that the relief sought by the petitioner has already been adjudicated and no error has been pointed out by the review-petitioner, while grounds raised in the review petition is an attempt to get the materials re-appreciated, which is impermissible in law, and is not open to this Court to re-appreciate the evidences and reach to the different conclusion, even if that is possible, which aspect has already been dealt with and suitably addressed in the case of *Kerala SEB v. Hitech Electrothermics & Hudropower Ltd* as reported in *2005(6) SCC 651*.

4. In view of the above, no ground is made out to review the order dated 22.09.2025 passed in CWJC No. 22319 of 2019, the instant application for review stands dismissed.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

