

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12684 of 2013

- =====
1. Angad Singh Son Of Late Balrup Yadav Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
 2. Ram Bahadur Singh Son Of Angad Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
 3. Teju Singh @ Tejbali Singh Son Of Angad Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Chief Secretary Government Of Bihar
2. Damodar Singh Son Of Late Jai Ram Singh @ Baikunth Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur
3. Shambhu Singh Son Of Late Jai Ram Singh @ Baikunth Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur
4. Chhedi Singh Son Of Late Balrup Yadav Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
5. Ramdal Singh Son Of Chhedi Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
6. Shesh Nath Singh Son Of Chhedi Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
7. Mahendra Singh Son Of Chhedi Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)
8. Birbal Singh Son Of Chhedi Singh Resident Of Village - Baghini, Police Station Mohania, District - Kaimur (Bhabhua)

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Devi Das Srivastava
For the State : Mr. Manoj Kumar, AC tomGP-24
For the respondents. : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Mishra

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-09-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and respondents.

This application is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the award dated 8.8.2012 passed in Pre-Litigation Case No. 378 of 2012, whereby the Lok Adalat,

Kaimur at Bhabhua passed the award on the basis of the compromise entered in between the parties in respect to partition of the joint family property.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that while the petitioners were party in the Pre-Litigation Case No. 378 of 2012 and put their signature on compromise, but behind them in the compromise petition, incorporated some words by cutting.

Learned counsel for the respondent no. 3 submits that in fact, petitioners were present on the date of passing of the award in the Lok Adalat and they put their signature on the compromise and also on the back of the award, but only with ill-motive the present case has been filed.

In view of the above submissions, I do not find any illegality amounting to abuse of process of Court for interference in extraordinary jurisdiction. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Shail/-

U			
---	--	--	--