

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1698 of 2011

=====

1. Dr. Fasih Ahmad Son Of Late Shah Safi Ullah Resident Of Mohalla- Maulabagh,
Police Station- Ara Town, District- Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Sajra Begum Wife Of Late Mehendi Hasan Son Of Late Mehendi Hasan
Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
2. Aftab Hasan Son Of Late Mehendi Hasan Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police
Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
3. Mehtab Hasan Son Of Late Mehendi Hasan Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police
Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
4. Eltaf Hasan Son Of Late Mehendi Hasan Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police
Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
5. Munni Begum Wife Of Abdul Khair Resident Of Village- Katesar, Police
Station- Bihta, District- Patna
6. Razia Begum Wife Of Name Not Known Resident Of Mohalla- Kasai Mohalla,
Raniganj, Police Station- Raniganj, District- Vardhawan(West Bengal)
7. Amna Begum Wife Of Name Not Known Resident Of Village- Dumraon, Police
Station- Dumraon, District- Buxar
8. Razia Begum Wife Of Manjoor Ahmad Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police
Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
9. Khurshid Ahmad Son Of Manjoor Ahmad Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, Police
Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
10. Tayba Khatoon Daughter Of Manjoor Ahmad Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari,
Police Station- Ara Nawada, District- Bhojpur
11. Abdul Rahim Son Of Abdul Hakim Resident Of Mohalla- Pakari, P.S.- Ara
Nawada, District- Bhojpur

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. RAHUL NATH, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr.



=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. NATH
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date: 10-01-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Appellant in the court below is the petitioner before this Court and is aggrieved by the order by which the learned court below has allowed the prayer made by the respondent no. 11 Abdul Rahim to be impleaded as respondent no. 3 in the appeal.

After considering the submissions on behalf of the petitioner and perusal of the impugned order, it is manifest that the learned court below in the impugned order has recorded that no objection was raised by the appellant against the impleadment of respondent no. 11 Abdul Rahim as party respondent in the appeal. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that no such stand was taken on behalf of the appellant raising no objection to the prayer for impleadment of respondent no. 11 Abdul Rahim as respondent in the appeal.

However, there is nothing on record nor the learned counsel for the petitioner could point out before this Court that any step was taken on behalf of the appellant before the court below itself against the wrong recording of the 'no objection' on behalf of the appellant-petitioner before the learned court below itself.

In the backdrop of these facts, this Court is not



inclined to invoke its jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

The application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(V. Nath, J)

Ranjan/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	20.01.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

