

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.221 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14105 of 2023

-
-
1. Munna Sahni Son of Krishna Dev Sahni, resident of Village, P.O. and P.S.- Gaighat, District - Muzaffarpur, Elected Secretary of Gaighat Prakhand Matasyajivi Sahyog Samiti Ltd. Gaighat.
 2. Gaighat Prakhand Matasyajivi Sahyog Samiti Ltd., Gaighat through its Elected Secretary Munna Sahni.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Pramandal, Muzaffarpur.
3. The District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
4. The District Fisheries Officer-cum-Chief Executive Officer, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Muzaffarpur.
6. The District Co-operative Officer, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Asst. Registrar Co-operative Societies, East Anchal, Muzaffarpur.
8. The Dy. Director Fisheries, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
9. The Anchaladhikari, Block- Gaighat, District - Muzaffarpur.
10. Balraj Sahni, Son of Late Yogendar Sahni, resident of village- Susta, P.O.- Susta Tok, P.S. Gaighat, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General 12

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-04-2026 Heard Mr. Deepak Kumar, learned counsel for the

review petitioners and Additional Advocate General 12 for the

State.

2. The present review petition has been filed for
reviewing the order dated 01.07.2024 passed in CWJC No.



14105 of 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the State has taken a preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the review petition and draws attention of this Court to the paragraph no. 2 of the order dated 01.07.2024 passed in CWJC No. 14105 of 2023 which is quoted hereinbelow:-

"2. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw this writ petition with liberty to the petitioners to move before the appropriate forum for challenging the cancellation of their membership."

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioners have *suo moto* sought liberty to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to the petitioners to move before the appropriate forum for challenging the cancellation of their membership.

5. Learned counsel for the State submits that principles relating to the review the jurisdiction is well ordained and settled and are quoted hereinbelow:-

"(i) The review is maintainable only in the event of discovery of new and an important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him.

(ii) Mistake or error apparent on the face of record and

(iii) For any other sufficient reason."



6. The expression 'any other sufficient reason' is not wide enough to include the perception of the Court regarding the petitioners that they had not approached the Court with clean hands. 'Any other sufficient reason' would include such ground which are analogous to the other two stipulated grounds under Order 47 Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

7. It appears from the review petition that the petitioners have not made out the case of the principles relating to review petition and petitioners themselves have sought permission to withdraw the writ petition.

8. In view of the aforesaid, no case is made out for reviewing the order dated 01.07.2024 passed in CWJC No. 14105 of 2023.

9. Accordingly, the present review petition stands dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

