IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI

Civil Review No.34 of 2020

1.The State of Jharkhand
2.The Secretary, Industries Department, Nepal House, PO and PS Doranda, Ranchi, Jharkhand
3.The Director, Handloom, Powerloom and Handicraft Industries Department, Penal House,PO and PS Doranda, Ranchi, Jharkhand
4.The Project Officer, Agro Project Centre, Gumla, PO and PS Gumla, District Gumla
5.The Treasury Officer, Gumla, PO and PS Gumla, District Gumla
.... Petitioner(s)

-- Versus --

1.Umakant Mandal, son of late Kusheshwar Mandal, resident of Village Bhirha, PO Amarpur, PS Suryagarha, District Luckhisaray, Bihar .... Respondent/ Opp.Party No.1
2.The Accountant General, Jharkhand, Ranchi, PO and PS Doranda, District Ranchi..... Respondent No.2/ Opp.Party No.2

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner(s) :- Mr. Rahul Kamlesh, Advocate
For the State :- Mr. Subodh Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For Accountant General:- Mr. Sudarshan Srivastav, Advocate

---

*10****/01.05.2026*** This petition has been filed for reviewing the order dated 27.8.2019 passed in W.P.(S) No.1430 of 2010.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said Writ Petition (S) was disposed of in order to provide some benefit as provided to one Sachidanand Prasad Verma in the case of W.P.(S) No.6584 of 2014. He next submits that the State has revisited the case of Sachidanand Prasad Verma and subsequent orders have been passed.

3. The aforesaid writ petition was disposed of based on the statement made in paragraph no.7 of the supplementary counter

affidavit filed by the respondent State and the following directions have been issued:

> *"Mr. Sunil Kumar Singh, the learned A.C. to S.C.(Mines) appearing for the respondent-State of Jharkhand fairly submits that the case of the petitioner is fully covered in view of the order of this Court rendered in "Sachidanand Prasad Verma" case (supra). He submits that the State has filed a supplementary counter-affidavit wherein paragraph no.7 it is admitted that the case of the petitioner is similar to that, and accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of in terms of the order dated 30.06.2017 passed in W.P.(S) No.6584 of 2014 with a direction to the respondents to take a decision taking into account the Memo No.1134 dated 16.08.2016 by which the benefit of salary for the post of Rear Technician has been provided to Sachidanand Prasad Verma and also the benefit of A.C.P. and M.A.C.P as has been done in the case of "Sachidanand Prasad Verma".*
>
> *The writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent no.3 to make the entire payment to the petitioner within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt /production of a copy of this order.*
>
> *With the aforesaid direction, this writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of."*

4. The aforesaid writ petition was disposed on the ground of providing same benefit as of one Sachidanand Prasad Verma and if the State has revisited the case of said Sachidanand Prasad Verma, and as such, the same relief is required to be given to the petitioner and that order is very clear.

5. No case of review of the said order is made out as the said order was passed considering the supplementary counter affidavit as disclosed in paragraph no.8 of the said affidavit and in course of argument it has not been denied that the said submission and affidavit was not there, and as such, this civil review petition is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated : 01.05.2026
SI/