

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.331 of 2024

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.192 of 2024

=====

Ravishankar Raman Son of Late Kamal Prasad Mandal Resident of-
Jhakhrahi Ward No.27, Supaul, District- Supaul, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Housing, Patna, Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Housing, State of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Municipal Administration-cum-Joint Secretary, Urban Development Department and Housing, State of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Project Officer-cum-Deputy Director, Urban Development and Housing, State of Bihar, Patna.
5. The Supaul Nagar Parishad, through the Municipal Executive Officer, Supaul Nagar Parishad, Supaul.
6. The Municipal Executive Officer, Supaul Nagar Parishad, Supaul.
7. Pramod Kumar Son of Suresh Rajak Resident of Village/Town/City- Diwari, Parwaniya, P.S.- Saharsa, District- Saharsa (Bihar), Pin-852201.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunit Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General 13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI
ORAL ORDER

9 01-05-2026 This is an application for review of a final order dated
12.09.2024 passed in CWJC No.192 of 2024.

2. In the said writ petition, one Pramod Kumar was the petitioner, who challenged his termination order from service as an Accountant at the Nagar Parishad, Supaul by the respondent Authority on the ground of illegality and arbitrariness without following due process of termination and also the procedure for regularization of service.



3. In the instant proceeding, one Ravishankar Raman is the petitioner, who has alleged that during the pendency of the writ petition he was appointed as the Accountant of Nagar Parishad, Supaul. If the order passed in the writ petition is executed, his service will be at stake without giving any opportunity of hearing.

4. Therefore, it is contended by the learned Advocate on behalf of the petitioner in Civil Review No.331 of 2024 that there is sufficient reason for the petitioner to apply for a review of the judgment to this Court.

5. The learned Advocate on behalf of the writ-petitioner is also present present, appearance is made on behalf of the learned Advocate for the State also.

6. I have heard the learned Advocates on behalf of the parties.

7. The writ-petitioner does not have any answer as to why the petitioner in the review petition was not added as a private respondent in the writ petition, because the effect of the judgment of the writ-Court directly and substantially affect the right of service of the present petitioner. He was not given opportunity to submit his case, if any.

8. It is also learnt from the submission made by the writ-petitioner that he knew that the applicant in the review



petition was appointed three months prior to the disposal of the writ petition. Therefore, the post from where the writ-petitioner was terminated and which was quashed by this Court vide order dated 12.09.2024 adversely affects the interest of the applicant in the review petition, so he has sufficient reason/ground to file the instant application and the impugned order passed by this Court on 12.09.2024 is not binding upon respondent No.7.

9. In view of the above discussion, the instant application for review is allowed. The order dated 12.09.2024 passed in CWJC No.192 of 2024 is set aside.

10. The writ-petitioner is directed to make Ravishankar Raman, applicant of Civil Review No.331 of 2024 as a party-respondent only then the writ petition shall be heard by the Competent Court having roster after giving due opportunity of appearance to the applicant.

11. With the above order, the instant review application is allowed on contest. There shall, however, be no order as to cost.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J)

mdrashid/-

U			
---	--	--	--

