

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.378 of 2016

=====

Dinesh Rai, Son of Late Uma Shankar Rai, resident of Village: Polia, P.S.:
Jagdishpur, District- : Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. Sakaldeep Rai
2. Sri Niwas Rai
3. Rajendra Prasad all sons of Dhadhari Rai, resident of Village: Palia P.S.:
Jagdishpur, District- Bhojpur.
4. Banshidhar Rai.
5. Ayodhya Rai Both sons of Sri Niwas Rai.
6. Binod Rai
7. Jitendra Rai
8. Munna Rai All sons of Rajendra Rai all resident of Village: Palia, P.S.:
Jagdishpur, District: Bhojpur.
9. Most. Basmati Kuwar, wife of Late Uma Shankar Rai.
10. Smt. Paratibha Devi, D/o Late Uma Shanakar Rai
11. Rubi Kumari, D/o Late Uma Shankar Rai.
12. Sri Suresh Rai, son of Late Uma Shankar Rai
13. Sri Ramesh Rai, son of Late Uma Shankar Rai.
14. Sri Pramod Rai son of Late Uma Shankar Rai all residents of village: Palia, P.S.:
Jagdishpur, District: Bhojpur.
15. Smt. Munia Devi, Wife of Sri Sudarshan Rai
16. Dr. Dharishani Devi, wife of Hridya Nand Rai both resident of
Village: Bahadurpur, P.S. Tarari, District: Bhojpur.
17. Smt. Tileshwari Devi, wife of Awadhesh Pandey, resident of Village:
Dharmpur, P.S.: Sahar, District; Bhojpur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Ravindra kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUNGESHWAR SAHOO

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 19-08-2016

Heard the learned counsel, Mr. Ravindra Kumar, for
the petitioner.

Perused the order dated 12.04.2016 passed by the
Munsif, Jagdishpur in Title Suit No. 120 of 1992/131 of 1998

whereby the court below has deleted the names of two of the plaintiffs who died recording the finding that they died issueless on merit.

In such view of the matter, it cannot be said that the order has prejudiced the present defendant-petitioner in any way nor it can be said that the order passed by the Court below is contrary to law or that it has been passed in the manner not permitted by law or that the order passed by the Court below is without jurisdiction.

Therefore, I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction.

Thus, this Miscellaneous Application is dismissed.

(Mungeshwar Sahoo, J)

S.Pandey/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	20.08.2016
Transmission Date	