

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

**Civil Review No. 11 of 2020**

1. Union of India through the Chief Security Commissioner, Railway Protection Force, East Central Railway, P.O. & P.S. Hazipur, District Hazipur (Bihar).
2. Chief Security Commissioner, Eastern Railway, Kolkata, P.O. & P.S. Kolkata, District Kolkata
3. The Division Security Commissioner/Sr. Divisional Security Commissioner, R.P.F. East Central, P.O. Dhanbad, P.S. Dhanbad, District Dhanbad (Jharkhand)
4. Staff Officer to Chief Secretary Commissioner, R.P.F., Eastern Railway, Kolkata, P.O. & P.S. Kolkata, District Kolkata.

... Petitioners/Appellant/Respondent

Versus

Ramesh Singh, aged about ... years, Son of Late Harinandan Singh, resident of Qr. No. 3A, Station Road, P.O. & P.S. Barkakana, District Hazaribagh presently residing at Flat No. 201, Shiv Hari Enclave, Budha Colony, Anderkila, P.O. & P.S. Hazipur, District Vaishali (Bihar) Pin Code 844101.

... Opp. Party/Respondent/Writ Petitioner

-----  
**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

-----  
For the Petitioners: Mr. Prashant Pallav, A.S.G.I.  
Ms. Shivani Jaluka, A.C. to A.S.G.I.  
-----

**10/Dated: 25.03.2026**

1. Heard Mr. Prashant Pallav, the learned A.S.G.I. for the review petitioner-Union of India.
2. This petition seeks review of the judgment and order dated 11.09.2019 dismissing L.P.A. No. 530 of 2012 against learned Single Judge's judgment and order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2012, partly allowing W.P. (S) No. 5338 of 2004.
3. Mr. Pallav, learned A.S.G.I., submits that issue of interpretation of Office Memorandum dated 04.11.1993 (Annexure 1) was already considered by the Department. He submits that the case of R.N. Giri, with whom the respondent had claimed parity, was quite different. He submits that since these aspects have not been considered, a case for review is made out.

4. We have considered Mr. Prashant Pallav's contention and perused the record.
5. The learned Single Judge by judgment and order 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2012 has only remanded the matter for consideration of the respondent's case in the light of Office Memorandum dated 04.11.1993 and the observations in the judgment and order dated 23.06.2004 disposing of W.P. (S) No. 832 of 2003. This decision of the learned Single Judge was not interfered with by the Division Bench, when disposing of L.P.A. No. 530 of 2012.
6. The contention now raised was sought to be raised by the Union of India before the Letters Patent Bench. However, the Letters Patent Bench noted that since this was a case of remand, no opinion needs be expressed on merits because expression of any such opinion might prejudice both the parties. The LPA was accordingly disposed of with observations.
7. We are satisfied that there is no error apparent on the face of record or any other ground for exercise of our review jurisdiction. Therefore, we dismiss this review petition. No costs.
8. The matter must now be disposed of by the appropriate authority in terms of the remand order within two months from today, if not already disposed of.
9. Pending interim applications, if any, will not survive and are disposed of.

**(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)**

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

**March 25, 2026**

**N.A.F.R.**

Manoj/ Sharda/Cp.2

Uploaded on 26.03.2026