

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.145 of 2015**

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1917 of 1991

=====

1. Bishwanath Singh.
2. Shubh Narain Singh.
Both Sons of Late Harbansh Singh, resident of Village-
Nawada, P.S.-Musahari, District-Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Sheo Dulari Devi, Wife of Ram Nandan Singh.
2. Bijay Singh @ Bijay Kumar Singh.
3. Manoj Kumar Singh.
Both Sons of Late Ram Nandan Singh.
4. Most. Laxmi Devi, Wife of Late Shyam Nandan Singh.
5. Most. Aruna Devi, Wife of Late Alok Singh, Son of Late
Shyam Nandan Singh.
6. Pramod Singh.
7. Praveen Kumar Singh.
Both Sons of Late Shyam Nanadan Singh.
All resident of Village-Nawada, P.S.-Musahari, P.O.-
Manika, District-Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondents-Respondent 1st Set

8. Consolidation Officer, Musahari, District-Muzaffarpur.
9. Dy. Director of Consolidation, Muzaffarpur.
10. Joint director, Consolidation, Bihar, Patna.
11. The State of Bihar.

.... Respondents-Opposite Parties 2nd Set

=====

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s :Mr. Brij Mohan Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s :Mr. Anjani Kumar, A.A.G.-6

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH**
ORAL ORDER

3 16-09-2015 Learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the

petitioners, states that C.W.J.C. No.1917 of 1991

had earlier stood dismissed for default since learned

counsel, who was on record and was conducting the

case on behalf of the petitioners had died. However,

subsequently, a restoration application was filed, seeking restoration of C.W.J.C. No.1917 of 1991, alongwith a Vakalatnama. The said restoration application was allowed and, accordingly, C.W.J.C. No.1917 of 1991 stood restored to its original file.

This is not in dispute that no Vakalatnama was filed on behalf of the petitioners in C.W.J.C. No.1917 of 1991, when the matter was taken up by this Court on 04.02.2015. This Court, in such circumstance, dismissed the writ application on the basis of the pleadings on record.

The present review application has been filed on the ground that since the name of the learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioners, was not printed in the daily cause list, there was no representation on his behalf and, therefore, this case could not be presented before this Court.

In my opinion, however, there would have not been any occasion for printing the name of learned counsel for the petitioners, as there was no Vakalatnama on record in the writ proceeding.

Learned counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioners, has attempted to persuade me, with the pleadings on record, that the order passed by this

Court, dated 04.02.2015, requires to be reviewed. However, he has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of record, warranting this Court to exercise review jurisdiction. I do not find any merit in this application.

This application is, accordingly, rejected.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Praveen-II/-

U			
---	--	--	--