

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.348 of 2023

In
Letters Patent Appeal No.256 of 2011

-
-
1. Sachidanand Sharma @ Sachida Nand Pandey Son of Late Raj Nandan Pandey Resident of Village-Luchisarai, Police Station-Ghosi, District-Jehanabad At Present resident Mohalla I.M.S. Road, Bhalolia Dharamshila, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh Now Koderma
 2. Yugal Kishore Sharma @ Yugal Sharma Son of Late Hari Narain Pandey Resident of Village-Luchisarai, Police Station-Ghosi, District-Jehanabad At Present resident Mohalla I.M.S. Road, Bhalolia Dharamshila, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh Now Koderma

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Joint Director, Consolidation, Gaya.
3. The Consolidation Officer Jehanabad.
4. The Assistant Consolidation Officer, Jehanabad.
5. Ram Pravesh Pandey Son of Late Jairam Pandey Resident of Village-Ginji, Police Station-Ghoshi, District-Jehanabad at Present Resident of Hanuman Mandir, I.N.S. Road Addi Bunglow, Jhumari Tilaiya, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh, Now Koderma.
6. Ram Udai Pandey Son of Late Jairam Pandey Resident of Village-Ginji, Police Station-Ghoshi, District-Jehanabad at Present Resident of Hanuman Mandir, I.N.S. Road Addi Bunglow, Jhumari Tilaiya, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh, Now Koderma.
7. Ram Sewak Pandey Son of Late Jairam Pandey Resident of Village-Ginji, Police Station-Ghoshi, District-Jehanabad at Present Resident of Hanuman Mandir, I.N.S. Road Addi Bunglow, Jhumari Tilaiya, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh, Now Koderma.
8. Arvind Kumar Sharma Son of Late Raj Nandan Pandey Resident of Village-Lukhisarai, Police Station-Ghoshi, District-Jehanabad at Present residing Mohalla-Taraland, Police Station-Jhumari Tilaiya, District-Hazaribagh, Now Koderma.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bijay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Arun Kumar Bhagat, AC to AAG-12



**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER**

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD)

6 08-12-2025 **Re. IA. No. 1 of 2025**

This is an application seeking condonation of delay of 3125 days in filing of the present civil review application.

2. In our order dated 01.12.2025, we have recorded that the limitation petition together with the main matters shall be considered.

3. In view of our previous order, we have considered the limitation petition.

4. This civil review application has been filed for reviewing the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court on 14.03.2013 in LPA No. 256 of 2011. The review application has been presented with a delay of over 10 years 9 months.

5. It is stated in the application that Ajai @ Ajay Kumar Sharma (appellant No. 2 of the aforesaid appeal) was the pairvikar of the case, who unfortunately died in December, 2018. About the present petitioner no.1, it is stated that he is an old man and resides at Jhumari Tilaiya and the petitioner no.2 (Yugal Kishore Sharma @ Yugal Sharma), is a bank employee



who is posted in Delhi at Punjab National Bank.

6. It is stated that the other petitioners were not aware about the pendency of the LPA and that as such they were not aware about the said case. It is further stated that since the death of Ajai @ Ajay Kumar Sharma, the landed property is to be partitioned and during partition process in December 2023, the petitioner learnt about the pendency of the appeal and they contacted the conducting advocate and thereafter took legal advice and filed this instant civil review.

7. We have considered the reasons shown in the application seeking condonation of delay. It is evident that the LPA No. 256 of 2011 was decided as back as on 14.03.2013 after hearing learned counsel for the parties. At least 5 years thereafter pairvikar of the case was alive, but no step was taken towards filing of a review.

8. The reasons shown in the application seeking condonation of delay are completely vague and do not inspire confidence of this Court. On these vague grounds, a delay of over 10 years is not fit to be condoned.

9. This application is dismissed.

Re. Civil Review No. 348 of 2023

10. As a result of dismissal of limitation petition, the



civil review application would also fail.

11. The civil review application stands dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

U			
---	--	--	--

