

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.95 of 2016

=====

Chaturbhuja Singh, Son of Late Ram Dahin Singh, Resident of Village +
P.O. - Balwakuari, P.S. - Hajipur Sadar, District - Vaishali at Hajipur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. Director - cum - Inspector General of Police, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Inspector General of Police, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
4. Superintendent of Police, Vaishali.
5. S.I. of Police, Police Station Hajipur Sadar.
6. Bijli Singh, Son of Late Bhim Singh,
7. Krishna Singh, Son of Late Bhopen Singh,
8. Ram Prasad Singh, Son of Late Arjun Singh,
9. Braj Kishore Singh, Son of Devendra Singh,
10. Subodh Singh, Son of Nandlal Singh,
11. Abhimanay Kumar, Son of Braj Kishore Singh, All respondent no. 6
to 11 are resident of village + P.O. - Balwakuari, P.S. - Hajipur Sadar,
District - Vaishali at Hajipur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr.Sadanand Paswan, GP 29

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT GUPTA
ORAL ORDER

3 24-02-2016 None is present on behalf of the petitioner again.

Yesterday also, none was present on behalf of the petitioner
even after the case was passed over to be taken up after few
cases earlier. Though the *Appearance* column of the order
dated 23.02.2016 records the presence of Dr. Om Prakash,
Advocate, on behalf of the petitioner.

I have been told that the name of the Advocate on
behalf of the petitioner in the *Appearance* column appears by
default in terms of the format of the order prepared by the

NIC. But in fact, no one was present on behalf of the petitioner and the name of the Advocate has been wrongly mentioned in the order dated 23.02.2016.

Since there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner again, this writ application is dismissed for default.

(Hemant Gupta, J)

mrl

U			
---	--	--	--