

(2005) 10 PAT CK 0022
In the Patna High Court
Case No : Civil Review No. 307 of 1999

Sudhir Kumar

APPELLANT

Vs

The Bihar State Electricity Board and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-10-2005

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2006) 1 PLJR 427

Hon'ble Judges : Narayan Roy, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Binod Kumar Singh, for the Appellant; Mihir Kumar Jha, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Narayan Roy, J.—Heard counsel for the parties. The review application has been filed against the order passed by this Court dated 7.9.1999 in M.J.C. No. 1546 of 1999.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the direction issued by this Court dated 28.4.1994 in C.W.J.C. No. 397 of 1994 has not fully and completely been complied with, and therefore, the order passed by this Court dated 7.9.1999 in Contempt Application aforesaid need be reviewed.

3. It appears that this Court while disposing of C.W.J.C. No. 397 of 1994 considering the supplementary counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents that 36 persons will be recruited for the Bihar State Electricity Board (hereinafter referred to as "Board"), directed to publish the result of 36 candidates in respect of the Board within a period six weeks from the date of presentation of the certified copy of order of this Court.

4. Mr. Mihir Kumar Jha, learned senior counsel for the opposite parties, submitted that on the basis of assertion made by him, this Court disposed of the contempt application on the premises that result of 36 persons were already published and today he is in possession of original record to show that after publication of result

of those 36 persons appointment letters have also been issued to them.

5. This Court on the basis of the submissions made by the parties and being satisfied that result of 36 candidates have already been published, dismissed the contempt application.

6. Virtually, no case has been made out by the petitioner for review of the order passed by this Court in its jurisdiction under the provisions of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

7. From the tenor of the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner, however, it appears that he has tried to make out a case for accommodation of the petitioner, namely, Sudhir Kumar.

8. Basically, questions of facts have been urged and no case has been made out for review of the order, as referred to above.

9. For the grievances of the petitioner, in my opinion, he could have made out a case for issuance of a writ in writ jurisdiction of this Court, but, in no way, a case for review has been made out.

10. For the reasons, aforementioned, therefore, I do not find any merit in this application. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

No order as to costs.