IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Civil Review No. 39 of 2026

Shiv Nandan Mishra, Aged about 54 years, Son of Late Ram Dev Mishra, Resident of Kila Mandir, P.O. & P.S.- Ramgarh, District- Ramgarh **.....Petitioner**

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Director (Secondary Education), School Education & Literacy Department, Govt. of Jharkhand, Ranchi. P.O. & P.S.- Dhurwa, District- Ranchi
3. Deputy Commissioner, Ramgarh, P.O. & P.S Ramgarh, District- Ramgarh.
4. Regional Deputy Director, Education, North Chotanagpur Division, Hazaribagh, P.O. & P.S.- Hazaribagh, District- Hazaribagh.
5. District Education Officer, Ramgarh, P.O. & P.S.- Ramgarh, District Ramgarh.
6. Head Master, State Steptized Girls School, Ramgarh Cantt, P.O. & P.S.- Ramgarh, District- Ramgarh

...Respondents

--

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN**

For the Petitioner(s) : M/s. Sanjeev Thakur, Shivam Kumar Jha, Advocates
For the Respondents : A.C to S.C.-IV

--

03/18.09.2026 After going through the finding and operative portion of the order dated *18.08.2025 in W.P.(S) No. 2105 of 2018*, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in view of the fact that the petitioner wants modification of *order dated 21.06.2017 in W.P.(S) No. 6211 of 2007* which is not possible in the instant case, where review is sought for in the order dated 18.08.2025 in W.P(S) No. 2105 of 2018. Moreover, para-5 of the order under review dated 18.08.2025, for which review has been sought, reads as follows:

> **"***5. Since there is nothing in the impugned order with regard to payment of admitted salary of the petitioner for the period he worked; as such, the instant application is hereby disposed of by*

> *giving liberty to the petitioner to approach the respondent No. 6 i.e. the Head Master, State Steptized Girl School, Ramgarh Cantt., where the petitioner was working and the moment the respondent No. 6 will receive representation of the petitioner, he will verify the records of the case and if at all it is found that the petitioner has actually worked for certain period for which payment has not been made, the same shall be paid to the petitioner."*

2. It is a simplicitor order, where the petitioner was granted liberty to approach the respondent no. 6 who in-turn was to decide the claim in accordance with law and on the basis of representation.

3. In any view of the matter, the review of an order in another case can't be done in this case. Accordingly, the instant application stands dismissed.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

18th September, 2026
Jk
Uploaded on
29/09/2026