

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10856 of 2014

=====

1. Awadhesh Kumar son of Nathuni Prasad resident of Mohalla - Ganj No.2 near
Laduram Gola, near Sitamai Mandir, P.S. Bettiah Town Distt. - West Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Urmila wife of late Ramashankar Prasad
2. Munna Kumar
3. Vijay Kumar
4. Suraj Kumar All sons of Late Ramashankar Pd. All 1 to 4 resident of Mohalla -
Mira Chauk, Goldarpatti, Ganj No.2, Ward No.26, P.S. Bettiah (T) Distt. - West
Champaran
5. Sunita Devi Wife of Deepak Prasad, D/o Late Ramashankar Prasad Resident of
Gopalganj, P.S. Gopalganj, District - Gopalganj
6. Mohan Prasad
7. Sohan Prasad
8. Narain Prasad All sons of Late Gopaljee Sah All resident of village - Areraj,
Near Someshwarnath Mandir, P.S. Areraj, Distt. - West Champaran

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aditya Nath Jha

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 12-07-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The defendant-petitioner in the present writ
application has questioned the sustainability of the impugned order
passed by the learned court below by which it has allowed the prayer
of the plaintiffs for deleting certain properties from the schedule of the
plaint of the suit.

3. Mr. Aditya Nath Jha, learned counsel for the
petitioner, submits that the petitioner has purchased the suit property

from one of the defendants and is in peaceful possession over the same. It has been further canvassed that the plaintiffs have deliberately prayed for amendment in the plaint by deleting those properties.

4. This Court after considering the submissions and perusing the impugned order does not find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner as this Court has not been persuaded to find that any prejudice will be caused to the interest of the petitioner, as claimed by him, if the prayer of the plaintiffs for deleting the properties of the petitioner has been allowed. This Court, therefore, is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.

5. This writ application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(V. Nath, J)

Amin/-

U			
---	--	--	--