

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19139 of 2013**

=====

1. Kranti Thakur, Son Of Late Sukan Thakur, Resident Of Village - Behat,  
Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Most Sukri Devi @ Sukhri Devi, Widow Of Late Sudhari Kamat  
Resident Of Village - Behat Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir,  
Jhanjharpur, District - Madhubani

2. Gyani Devi, Daughter Of Late Sudhai Kamat Resident Of Village - Behat  
Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

3. Ghuran Devi, Daughter Of Late Sudhai Kamat Resident Of Village -  
Behat Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

4. Umesh Kamat, Son Of Late Sudhai Kamat Resident Of Village - Behat  
Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

5. Dinesh Kamat, Son Of Late Sudhai Kamat Resident Of Village - Behat  
Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

6. Rajesh Kamat, Son Of Late Laxmi Kamat Resident Of Village - Behat  
Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

7. Chandeshwar Kamat, Son Of Late Laxmi Kamat Resident Of Village -  
Behat Tole - Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District -  
Madhubani

8. Shiv Kamat, Son Of Late Laxmi Kamat Resident Of Village - Behat Tole  
- Adalpur, Police Station - R.S. Shivir, Jhanjharpur, District - Madhubani

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prabhas Ranjan, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      15-12-2017      This writ application has been filed to quash the order  
  
dated 06.06.2013 passed by learned Munsif, Jhanjharpur in Title  
  
Suit No.40 of 1995 whereby and whereunder the amendment  
  
petition filed on behalf of the defendant was allowed.



2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

3. It appears that in course of evidence the defendant filed amendment petition praying therein to insert paragraph 4 'k' after paragraph 4 whereunder the defendant pleaded that the suit of plaintiff is barred under Section 18 of the Bihar Privileged Persons Homestead Tenancy Act and Section 34 of the Specific Relief Act. By this amendment, the defendant has pleaded that the suit is barred by above statute. No fresh material has been sought to be brought on record and so the nature does not change requiring any evidence from either of the parties.

4. In view of above facts and circumstances, I do not find any merit in this application. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed.

**(Sanjay Kumar, J)**

Harish/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

