

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.266 of 2023
In
Letters Patent Appeal No.1701 of 2019

-
-
1. Asst. General Manager, State Bank of India, Centralized Pension Processing Centre, 4th Floor, Administrative Building, Judges Court Road, Patna.
 2. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Salmari, Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Shahara Bano W/o Late Mahboob Alam Resident of Village-Dandama, P.S.- Azam Nagar, and District-Katihar.
2. The Director Primary Education, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Superintendant of Education, Katihar.
4. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rakesh Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sarvesh Kumar Singh (Aag 13)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY)

3 16-01-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

*(i) for review of the Order dated
18.05.2022, passed by this Hon'ble Court,
in connection with Letters Patent Appeal
No. 1701 of 2019 (The Asst. General*



*Manager State Bank of India & Ors.
Versus. Shahar Bano and Ors.) arising out
of CWJC No. 14320 of 2018 (Shahar
Bano, W/o Late Mahboob Alam vs. The
State of Bihar through the Principal
Secretary, Education Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna & Ors.)..*

3. In this case, the LPA No. 170 of 2019 was dismissed on 18.05.2022.

4. The review petition came to be filed on 19.09.2023 much beyond the time for filing it. Naturally, it should have come alongwith limitation petition which was not done.

5. The office pointed out the defects which included the defect no.35 recording that the limitation petition has not been filed. Despite the office pointed it out, no limitation petition was filed.

6. The matter went before the learned Joint Registrar (J) on 23.06.2025 who gave time till 21.07.2025 for taking necessary steps.

7. As per the office notes, even then, no limitation petition filed.



8. Clearly, the review petitioner has no interest in pursuing the review petition. It was filed much beyond the time for filing such review. Naturally, it should have come alongwith the limitation petition. Even then, a long rope was given.

9. This Court is of the view that a review petition filed after inordinate delay without the limitation petition needs dismissal.

10. Accordingly ordered. The Review Petition no. 266 of 2023 is dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

