

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVIEW No.486 of 2017
In
Letters Patent Appeal No.30 of 2014

Nand Kishore Chaudhary son of Late Maluki Chaudhary, resident of village-
Sukhpur, P.S. Supaul, District- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Old Secretariat, Patna
2. The Secretary, Department of Water Resources, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation, Sinchai Bhawan, Patna
4. The Collector, Supaul
5. The Rehabilitation Officer, Koshi Project, Supaul, District- Supaul

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Choudhary, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar, AAG 4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

9 01-08-2024

Heard I.A. No. 9028 of 2017.

2. There is a delay of 3 years and 23 days in
presenting the Civil Review No. 486 of 2017.

3. Reasons for condonation of delay are narrated in
paragraphs 2 to 6 of the interlocutory application and it reads as
under :

“2. That, it is stated and submitted that order under



review was reserved on 17.07.2014 and after three months case was again listed on 21.10.2014 but the advocate for the petitioner could not marked his case list and due to mistake of the advocate order was not properly communicated to the petitioner.

3. That, it is humbly submitted that when the petitioner came to Patna in the month of December, 2017 to enquire about his status of case then came to know about the order passed in the order under review.

4. That, thereafter he requested his learned to file the present review application and accordingly the same is being filed with limitation petition.

5. That there was/is no deliberate and intentional latches on the part of the petitioner rather the same has been occurred to the reason as stated above.

6. That the instant case is good on merit and if the delay in the filing the instant review application is not condoned the petitioner shall suffer irreparable loss without having any fault on their part.”

4. Reading of the aforementioned pleadings to condone the enormous delay of about 3 years and 23 days reveals that sufficient cause has not been shown. Therefore,



petitioner has not made out a case so as to condone the delay of about 3 years and 23 days in presenting the present review petition.

5. Accordingly, I.A. No. 9028 of 2017 stands dismissed. Resultantly, Civil Review No. 487 of 2017 stands dismissed.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

mcv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

