

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Review No.220 of 2000

In
CW 1422 of 97

=====

Shailendra Singh @ Shivji Singh, Son of Late Nand Kishore Singh, R/o
Mohalla-Ujjaintola, P.O.& P.S.-Bettiah, District-West Champaran.

.... Petitioner.

Versus

1. Om Narayan Singh, Son of Sri Ramjee Singh, R/o Mohalla- Ujjaintola,
P.O.& P.S.-Bettiah, District-West Champaran .
2. Narayan Singh , Son of Late Markandey Singh, R/o Village-Imalipatti-
Majhali, P.O.-Chakia, District-Chandauli (U.P.).
3. Prabhu Nath Singh, Son of Sri Ramjee Singh, R/o Village-Imalipatti-
Majhali, P.O.-Chakia, District-Chandauli (U.P.).
4. i. Anil Kumar Singh.
ii. Sunil Kumar Singh.
Both Sons of Late Jung Bahadur Singh, R/o Village-Imilipatti-
Majhali, Tahsil-Chakia, P.O.-Teari, District-Varanasi.
5. Ram Surat Singh, Son of Sri Ramjee Singh, R/o Village-Imalipatti-
Majhali, Tahsil-Chakia, P.O.-Teari, District-Varanasi(U.P.).
6. i. Prem Narayan Singh.
ii. Pradip Narayan Singh.
iii. Pravin Narayan Singh.
All sons of Late Aditya Narayan Singh, permanent resident of Village-
Imalia, Manghali, Pargana-Karamagrur, Tahsil-Chakia, District-
Chandauli, (Utter Pradesh).
7. Ekbal Singh @ Ekbal Narain Singh, Son of Late Surat Prasad Singh,
R/o Village-Imalipatti-Majhali, Tahsil-Chakia, P.O.-Teari, District-
Varanasi (U.P.) Opposite Parties.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shola Sandhwar
Mr. Rajiv Nayan Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr.
Mr. Dev Kumar Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH
ORAL ORDER

27 03-02-2016

No body appears on behalf of the petitioner.

The learned counsel for the opposite parties is present.

Perused the office note from which it transpires that this review application stood dismissed for default for non-compliance of the order dated 02.09.2015 as against the opposite party nos.4(i) and 4(ii). It further transpires that the opposite party nos.4(i) and 4(ii) were the substituted heirs of the deceased opposite party no.4 who was also one of the plaintiffs in the suit as it appears from the review application itself. It does not appear from the office report that any step has been taken for restoration of this review application as against the opposite party nos.4 (i) and 4(ii).

In this backdrop, proceeding further with this review application may result in inconsistent or conflicting orders.

The review application is dismissed as incompetent.

(V. Nath, J)

Nitesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--