

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CIVIL REVIEW No. 109 of 2023**

**In**  
**Letters Patent Appeal No.1440 of 2019**

- 
1. The Central Board of Trustees Employees Provident Fund Organisation through the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner-II (Legal), Employees Provident Fund Organisation, Regional Office, R. Block, Road NO.6, P.S. Sachivalaya, District-Patna.
  2. The regional Provicent Fund Commissioner, Bihar, Bhavishya Nidhi Bhawan, R. Block, Road, No.6, Patna- 800001
  3. The Assistant Provident Fund Commissioner, Bihar, Bhavishya Nidhi Bhawan, R. Block, Road, No.6, Patna- 800001

... .. Petitioners

Versus

M/s Super Kisan Udyog Through Proprietor Sheikh Shahnawaz Hussain,  
Village-Dubey, Dehariya Rampur, P.O. Mujan, District-Kaimur, Bhabhua.

... .. Opposite Party

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/EPFO : Mr. Prashant Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Parties : Mr.

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH**

**and**

**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

**(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH)**

5      30-03-2026

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present application has been preferred by the petitioner seeking review of the order dated 14.11.2022 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in LPA No. 1440 of 2019, whereby the appeal filed by the private respondents was disposed of with the following observations :

*"We thus intend to and modify the order of the learned Single Judge to the extent that the appellant shall be liable to pay simple interest on Rs. 15,02,391/- from 13.12.2006 to 04.09.2015, and further interest till date for not*



*having paid the interest i.e. from 04.09.2015 to 05.11.2019 (date of filing the appeal).*

*The EPFO shall calculate the aforesaid amount, intimate the respondent of such calculation and shall make payment of such amount forthwith, which exercise shall be concluded within a period of 30 days to be counted from today."*

3. Upon perusal of the materials available on record, we are of the considered view that no case is made out warranting exercise of the power to review. No error apparent on the face of the record has been demonstrated so as to justify interference. It is well settled that the power of review cannot be exercised as an appellate jurisdiction.

4. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we find no merit in the present review application, and the same is accordingly dismissed.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(Sudhir Singh, J.)**

**(Shailendra Singh, J.)**

*Gaurav Kumar/-*

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

