

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.289 of 2018

In
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2646 of 2014

=====

M/s P. K. R. Enterprises, Through Its Proprietor, Pramod Kumar Rai Son of Sri Jagdish Rai resident of Vilage and P.O.-Mohanpur, Via-Kashipur, P.S.-Samastipur (Mu), District-Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through Sri Madhresh Kumar, The General Manager, East Central Railway, Hajipur.
2. Sri Arun Mallic, The Divisional Railway Manager (Engg), East Central Railway, Samastipur.
3. Sri Mahbub Alam, The Senior Divisional Enginer (Co-ordination),East Central Railway, Samastipur.
4. Sri Rajnandan Rai The Senior Engineer (Works), Water Supply East Central Railway, Samastipur.
5. Sri Shil Aashish, The Senior Divisional Finance Manager, East Central Railway, Samastipur.
6. Sri Vir Singh, The Assistant Town Engineer, East Central Railway, Samastipur.
7. Sri Sanjay Kumar, The Junior Engineer (Works), Water Supply, East Central Railway, Samastipur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar
For the Respondents	:	Mr. Subodh Kumar Jha, Sr. CGC
		Mr. Ram Tujabh Singh, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

7 17-04-2025 Heard Mr. Manoj Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Subodh Kumar Jha, learned senior counsel representing Union of India duly assisted by Mr. Ram Tujabh Singh, learned CGC for the Railways.

2. The present review application has been preferred
for:



“This review application is directed against the order dated 08.02.2018 passed by Hon’ble Justice Smt. Anjana Mishra in M.J.C. No. 2646 of 2014 which arose out of order dated 08.03.2013 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 20598 of 2012.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though railways have extended their hand to sit across the table so that if there is any other grievance, the same can be discussed /presented before the Arbitrator, he has some apprehension on whether the points raised will be considered or not.

4. Mr. Subodh Kumar Jha, representing the Railways, on the other hand, submits that despite the clear invitation made by him as recorded in the contempt order that they are ready to sit across the table, merely on the basis of apprehension, the petitioner is seeking review which cannot be granted.

5. Having heard the parties and perusing the records, this Court finds force in the submission of Union of India (Railways). Clearly, in the contempt order it doesn’t observed that the railways are ready to sit across the table and any apprehension that the petitioner has is misconceived.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he shall be approaching the concerned Respondent



No. 2 along with proper petition.

7. The facts have been incorporated. It is for the petitioner to decide whether to approach the respondent authority.

8. The review petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ranjeet/-

U			
---	--	--	--

