

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5120 of 2016

=====

Chandeshwar Prasad Jaiswal & Ors

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Kedar Sah & Ors

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ved Prakash Srivastva

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUNGESHWAR
SAHOO
ORAL ORDER

2 25-07-2016

Heard learned Senior counsel, Mr. M.N. Parbat,
appearing for the petitioners.

2. Perused the order dated 21.12.2015. From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that the security bond has been furnished by the appellants of T.A. No. 59 of 2011 pursuant to the order dated 27.11.2015, whereby the court below had directed the appellant to furnish the security in terms of Order 41 Rule 3 C.P.C.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners submitted that forgery has been committed by the appellants-respondents while furnishing the security bond in the court below. The court below should have decided the same but the court below has called for the record of execution case and has kept it on record. No order has been passed regarding the acceptance or rejection of the security bond furnished by the appellants-respondents.

4. In view of the nature of order passed by the court below, in my opinion, the order is only routine order and, therefore, it is not a cause for interference in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction. Thus, this writ application is dismissed.

(Mungeshwar Sahoo, J)

brajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--