

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.181 of 2014

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 9103 of 2007

=====

Bibi Mahida Khatoon

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Syed Teyabul Tahid & Ors.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Raj Nandan Prasad

For the State : Mr. Amresh Kumar Siwha, A.C. to G.A.1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMAR
DATTA
ORAL ORDER

4 15-09-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the State.

The civil review application has been filed for review of the
order dated 20.12.2013 passed in C.W.J.C. No.9103 of 2007.

At the stage of argument, learned counsel for the petitioner
does not raise any legal objection to the said order, except to say
that there was a direction of this Court to dispose of the title suit
by the learned Sub-ordinate Judge, in seisin of the said case,
within a period of six months but the same has not been done
despite the passage of nearly two years and nine months. The
same does not appear to be any ground for filing a review
application.

As a matter of fact, it appears that the review-petitioner,
who was respondent No.4 in the writ application, despite the

service of notice, did not appear and the allegation has been made against her that she had executed as many as 13 sale deeds during the pendency of the miscellaneous appeal which were much more than her claim/share in the family properties.

For the said reason, the writ application was allowed and the respondent No.4 was restrained from transferring any part of the suit land by any further sale deed during the pendency of the suit.

In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, no ground for review has been pointed out by learned counsel for the review-petitioner, particularly considering the fact that she did not appear in the writ petition and contest the same. The review application is, accordingly, dismissed as being devoid of any merit.

(Ramesh Kumar Datta, J)

V.P.Sinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--