

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.352 of 2017

=====

Dilip Prasad Singh, son of Late Dineshwar Prasad Chaudhary @
Guneshwar Singh, resident of Village Deogan Charbhara, P.S.- Bochahan,
PO- Gharbhara, Munsiffi, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. Lalan Paswan
2. Badal Paswan
3. Ramesh Paswan, above are sons of Bhubneshwar Paswan, resident of
Village- Deogan Tola Gharbhara, P.- Gharbhara, P.S and Anchal
Bochahan, Munsiffi, District- Muzaffarpur.
4. Ratan Deep Kumar, son of Abhay Kishore Sinha,
5. Chandradeep Kumar, son of Abhay Kishore Sinha,
6. Babloo Kumar, son of Late Jogendra Prasad Sinha @ Nagendra Singh,
7. Niloo Singh, son of Late Satyandra Chaudhary @ Satyadeo Chaudhary.
8. Tinku Singh, son of Late Satyandra Chaudhary @ Satyadeo Chaudhary.
9. Sonu Singh, son of Late Satyandra Chaudhary @ Satyadeo Chaudhary,
10. Mukesh Prasad Singh, son of Late Diwakar Prasad Chaudhary,
11. Brajesh Kumar Singh, son of Late Diwakar Prasad Chaudhary,
12. Ratnesh Kumar, son of Late Sudhakar Prasad Singh,
13. Ratnakar Prasad Singh, son of Late Raghvendra Prasad Singh, all are
residents of Village Beogan Tole Bharbhara, P. - Gharbhara, P.S. and
Anchal- Bochahan, Munsifi and District- Muzaffarpur.
14. Chandra Shekhar Prasad Singh, son of Late Narmdeshwar Prasad
Chaudhary,
15. Rajan Prasad Singh, son of Late Narmdeshwar Prasad Chaudhary,
16. Rakesh Prasad Singh, son of Late Narmdeshwar Prasad Chaudhary,
17. Deepak Prasad Singh, son of Late Dineshwar Prasad Chaudhary,
18. Prakash Prasad Singh, son of Late Dineshwar Prasad Chaudhary, All are
resident of Village- Deogan Gharbhara, P.S.- Bochahan, PO- Gharbhara,
Munsifi and District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.



=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH

ORAL ORDER

2 28-02-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

The present application has been filed against the original order passed in the suit refusing the prayer of the plaintiff-petitioner for injunction.

The impugned order is appealable under the provisions of the C.P.C. Therefore, this Court holds that the present application is misconceived and is dismissed, as such.

(V. Nath, J)

Devendra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

