


IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Revision No.129 of 2011



- =====
1. Sukhi Kumar/Sutihar , son of Late Garbhu Kumar.
 2. Birendra Mistri.
 3. Sunil Mistri.
 4. Vakil Mistri.
 5. Manoj Mistri.

All sons of Sukhi Sutihar.

All resident of village-Karha, P.S. & District-Saharsa.

–Plaintiff/Appellant/Petitioners.

Versus

1. Smt. Manju Devi, Wife of Sri Chandeshwar Jha @ Manikant Jha.
2. Chandeshwar Jha @ Manikant Jha, son of Late Baidyanath Jha.
3. Sri Raj Kumar Jha, son of Sri Chandeshwar Jha.

All Resident of village-Kahra, P.S.& District-Saharsa.

–Defendants/Respondents/Opp.Party 1st set.

4. Md. Disco Son of Late Amruddin.
5. Md. Ishrafil Ansari, Son of Late Amruddin.
6. Bibi Roshan Khatun, D/o Late Amruddin.

All residents of Village-Kahra, P.S. & District-Saharsa.

-Defendants/Respondents /Opp.Party 2nd set.

7. Most.Mundai Devi D/o Late Pathar Kamal Wife of Vakil Sharma,
Resident of Balha, P.S.- Saidpurthana Mansi, Zila Khagaria.

-Defendants /Respondents/Opp.Party 3rd set.

8. Baidyanath Mistri.
9. Suresh Mistri.

Sons of Bacha Kumar.

10. Bucho Kr. Son of late Adrik Kumar.
11. Kari Mistri.

12. Chhoti Misri

Sons of Late Bucho Kr.

All residents of Karha, P.S. & District-Saharsa.

---Plaintiff/Respondents/Opp.Party 4th Set.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Mukund

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH
ORAL ORDER

16 15-09-2015

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

From the perusal of the office note it appears that this revision application has already stood dismissed as against the opposite party nos.4 to 8 and 10 to 14. Nothing could be pointed out on behalf of the petitioners that this revision application can proceed even in absence of those opposite parties.

The learned counsel for the opposite parties has submitted that the Title Suit No.42/2006 out of which this revision application has arisen, has already been finally disposed of by judgment and decree dated 25.10.2013. This fact has not been controverted on behalf of the petitioner.

In view of the aforesaid facts that this revision application has already stood dismissed as against the opposite party nos. 4 to 8 and 10 to 14, the proceeding further with this revision application may result in inconsistent orders.

In result, this revision application is
dismissed as incompetent.

(V. Nath, J)

Nitesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

