

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI  
**Civil Review No. 73 of 2025**

-----

1. Md. Mohjamil Haque, S/o Abdul Haque, resident of Chandrapara, P.O.-Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.
2. Sabiha Naai, S/o Md. Inamul Haque, resident of Chandrapara, P.O.-Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.
3. Mahidur Rehman, S/o Naijul Sk., resident of Chandrapara, P.O.-Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.
4. Abdul Tayyab Ansari, S/o Abdul Kalam Ansari, resident of Chandrapara, P.O.-Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.

**....Petitioner(s).**

**(Respondents no. 8 to 11 in the Writ Petition)**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Secretary, Human Resources Department, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, P.O. & P.S.-Dhurwa, Town and District-Ranchi.
2. The Secretary Jharkhand Academic Council, Ranchi, Gyandeeep Kapoor, Bargawan, P.O. & P.S.- Namkum, District-Ranchi.
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Pakur, P.O., P.S. & District-Pakur.
4. The Sub-divisional Officer, Pakur, P.O., P.S. & District-Pakur.
5. The District Education Officer-cum-Public Information Officer, Pakur, P.O., P.S. & District-Pakur.
6. The Secretary, Madarsa, Emdadul Uloom, Chandrapara, P.O.-Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.
7. Asgar Ali, son of Head Moulvi, resident of Pakur, P.O., P.S. and District- Pakur
8. The Managing Editor, Prabhat Khabar, at P.O. & P.S.- Deoghar, District- Deoghar
9. Obaidur Rahman, son of Samsul Hoda, resident of Chandrapara, P.O. Rahashpur, P.S.-Pakur (M), District-Pakur.

**... Opp. Party(s).**

**With**

**Civil Review No. 80 of 2025**

1. Secretary, Madarsa, Imdadul Uloom, Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur
2. Asgar Ali, aged about 47 years, S/o Late Abul Sheikh, head moulvi, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur

**....Respondents No. 6 and 7/Petitioners**

**Versus**

1. Obaidur Rahman, S/o Samsul Hoda, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur

**...Petitioner/respondent No.1**

2. State of Jharkhand through its Secretary, Human Resources Development Department, Project Bhawan, Dhruwa, Ranchi
3. Secretary, Jharkhand Academic Council, Ranchi, Gyandeeep Kapoor, Bargawan, PO & PS Namkum, District Ranchi

4. Deputy Commissioner, Pakur, PO & PS Pakur, District- Pakur
5. Sub-Divisional Officer, Pakur, P.O, P.S. & District- Pakur
6. District Education Officer-cum-Public Information Officer, Pakur, PO, PS & District Pakur
7. Md. Mohjamil Haque, S/o Abdul Haque, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur
8. Sabiha Naz, daughter of Mohd. Inamul Haque, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur
9. Mahidur Rahman, S/o Najjul Shaikh, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur
10. Abdul Tayyab Ansari, S/o Abdul kalam Ansari, resident of Chandrapara, PO: Rahashpur, PS: Pakur (M), District: Pakur
11. Managing Editor, Prabhat Khabar, at PO PS Deoghar, District: Deoghar, Respondents 1-6 and 7-11

**....Respondents/Opposite parties (second set)**

-----  
**CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.**  
-----

For the Petitioner(s)	: Mr. Manoj Tandon, Advocate Mr. A.K. Sahani, Advocate
For the State	: Ms. Aditee Dongrawat, AC to G.P.-V (in C.Rev.No.73/2025) Mr. Baibhav Gahaut, AC to AAG-V (in C.Rev.No.80/2025)
For the Resp-JAC	: Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate Mr. J.P. Jha, Sr. Advocate Mr. Aishwarya Prakash, Advocate

.....

04/ 08.05.2025: Heard, learned counsel for the parties.

2. These Review petitions have been filed to review the order dated 28/04/2025 passed by the Court in WP(S) No. 2762 of 2017, whereby the writ has been allowed and the appointment of the private respondents therein has been set aside.

3. The case relates to appointment of teachers in 2016 in which respondent Nos.8 to 11 of the writ petition was approved by JAC. The appointments were challenged alleging irregularities, leading to multiple enquiries and the writ petition. The High Court on 28.04.2025 set aside the appointments resulting in the present review petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there is an error apparent on the face of the record inasmuch as the Court while passing the judgment dated 28.04.2025 did not properly appreciate the materials brought on record by the respondents therein. It has further been submitted

that the appointments were made pursuant to a duly published advertisement and after conducting written examination and interview. It is further contended that the Jharkhand Academic Council had also approved the appointments after conducting enquiry through the Regional Deputy Director of Education, Dumka.

5. Learned counsel for respondents submits that the review petitioners are seeking rehearing of the entire matter, which is impermissible in review jurisdiction. He further submits that the review petition is nothing but an attempt to re-argue the writ petition on merits. He further submits that no error apparent on the face of the record has been pointed out so as to warrant exercise of review jurisdiction.

6. The scope of review jurisdiction is very limited. A review can be entertained only when there is discovery of new and important matter or evidence which was not within the knowledge of the party or there exists some mistake or error.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **S. Murali Sundaram v. Jothibai Kannan reported in (2023) 13 SCC 515** in paragraph 18 has held as under-

*18. In Shanti Conductors (P) Ltd. [Shanti Conductors (P) Ltd. v. Assam SEB, (2020) 2 SCC 677 : (2020) 2 SCC (Civ) 788], it is observed and held that scope of review under Order 47 Rule 1CPC read with Section 114CPC is limited and under the guise of review, the petitioner cannot be permitted to reagitate and reargue questions which have already been addressed and decided. It is further observed that an error which is not self-evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under Order 47 Rule 1CPC.*

7. Considering the judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the facts of the case, I find that the petitioners have not pointed out any error on the face of the record in the order dated 28.04.2025 passed in W.P.(S) No.2762 of 2017. The petitioners by filing these review petitions have tried to convince this Court that this court did not properly appreciate the materials brought on record by the respondents, which is not the scope of review application. The order which has been passed by this court is a well reasoned order. Further, Review jurisdiction cannot be exercised as a tool

of rehearing of the matter, nor the same can be given the colour of appeal. Furthermore, this Court does not find any error or mistake apparent in the order dated 28.04.2025 to review the same.

8. Accordingly, both the Civil Review petitions are **dismissed**.

9. I.A No.16437 of 2025, I.A No.15832 of 2025 and I.A. No.6237 of 2025 also stands dismissed.

**(ANANDA SEN, J.)**

08<sup>th</sup> May, 2026  
R.S.  
Uploaded on 15/05/2026