

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.512 of 2015
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 13727 of 2010**

=====

1. Faiz Ahmad Ansari.
2. Jaki Ahmad.
3. Jubair Ahmad.
4. Pervez Ahmad Ansari.
5. Samim Ahmad. All Sons of Late Ismail Mian.
6. Israt Jahan.
7. Khairon Nisa.
8. Yasmin Parveen.
9. Jalila Khatoon. All the daughters of Late Ismail Mian. All resident of village - Banauli, P.S.- Chenari, District - Rohtas.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Additional Member, Board of Revenue, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. The L.R.D.C. Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. Nasim Mian. Son of Late Yusuf Mian. Resident of village - Banauli, P.O. & P.S.- Chenari, District - Rohtas.
6. Md. Alimuddin. Son of Late Hazi Abdul Halim. Resident of village - Banauli, P.O. & P.S.- Chenari, District - Rohtas.
7. Md. Adil.
8. Md. Amil. Minor Sons of Alimuddin under the guardian of Alimuddin father and guardian.
9. Nargish Khatoon (Minor).
10. Nazrish Khatoon (Minor).
11. Naheed Khatoon (Minor).
12. Nooz Hat Khatoon. Sl. No. 9 to 12 all daughter of Md. Alimuddin, under the guardianship of Alimuddin, father and guardian. All Resident of village - Banauli, P.O. & P.S.- Chenari, District - Rohtas.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. GP2- R.K. SINGH

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI)

Date: 12-07-2017



The Court of law cannot be indulgent towards litigants, who deliberately have tried to hoodwink the Court by not making a declaration about a previous writ application having been moved against the impugned order passed by a Member, Board of Revenue. A Statement made in the writ application about lack of knowledge about the order of the Member, Board of Revenue, has also been disproved by the respondents in their counter affidavit by giving details about the number of requisitions filed as well as the dates on which the certified copies of the order of the Member, Board of Revenue was obtained.

In the opinion of this Court, the learned single Judge was indulgent by only imposing cost upon the appellants to be deposited before the Bihar State Legal Services Authority, Patna, and not ordered prosecution of these appellants.

The conduct of the appellants being what it is and the order indicates such a position in detail, it is not a fit case where any interference is required to be made in the interest of justice as well as to keep the stream of justice pure.

Appeal has no merit. It is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J.)

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J.)

Rakhi

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	13.07.2017
Transmission Date	

