

1

cf 95557

IN THE HIGH COURT JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR
CHHATTISGARH

First Appeal No. 05 /2003

Appellants
Plaintiffs

P.R. No. 02703
Presented by Shri Ramul A24
dated 02.01.2003

1. Gajanand aged about 71 years S/o Late Ramu Barai R/o Kankalipara, Raipur.
2. Gangaram aged about 68 yrs S/o Late Ramu Barai R/o Kankalipara, Raipur.
3. Gayaram aged about 58 yrs (deceased)
3. (a) Kadam Bai Wd/o Gayaram aged 60 years
- (b) Leela Dhar aged 42 years
- (c) Govind aged 39 years
- (d) Gopal aged 34 years
- (e) Gopi aged 31 years
- (f) Basant aged 24 years
- (g) Kumari Bai aged 37 years
- (h) Ku. Rukhmadi Bai aged 29 yrs
- (i) Sushila Bai aged 27 years
- Sl.No. 3 B to 3 I all are S/o of Late Gaya Ram Barai
- Sl.No. 3 A to 3 I all are R/o of Vill. Mandhar, Block Dharsiva District - Raipur (C.G.)
4. Dayaram aged about 43 yrs (deceased)
4. (a) Smt. Kameshwari Bai Wd/o Dayarm aged about 50 years
- (b) Mohan S/o Late Dayaram aged about 32 years
- (c) Ghanshyam S/o Late Dayaram aged about 30 years.
- (d) Shyamlal S/o Late Dayaram aged about 28 years
- (e) Hare Krishna S/o Late Dayaram aged about 26 years

(f) Raj Kumar S/o Late Dayaram aged about 24 years.

(g) Minor Ram Krishna S/o Late Dayaram aged about 16 years.
by natural gurdian and month Smt. Kameshawari Bai Wd/o Late Daya Ram
All resident of Kankali Para, Raipur
Tahsil & District : Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS

Respondent No.1
Defendent No. 1

1. Samta Sahkari Grih
Nirman Sanstha Samiti
Through President,
Regd.No.
Up.Pe./R.P.R./35/71-72
Chirhuldi Ward Raipur Tahsil
& Distt. Raipur (M.P.) now
C.G.

Respondent No.2
Defendent No. 2

2. Govt. of (M.P.) now
Chhattisgarh
Through Collector, Raipur
Tah. & Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

Appeal Under Section 96 of the Code of Civil Procedure



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

FA No. 5 of 2003

(26)

- Gajanand & Others

---- Appellants

Versus

- Samta Sahkari Grih Nirman Samiti & Another

---- Respondents

For Appellants

None

For Respondent/State

Shri Sameer Behar, PL for the State.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

05/10/2017

- 1) The matter was passed over once in absence of any representation on behalf of the appellants. No one appears for the appellants even in the second call.
- 2) In the circumstances, there is no other option left with the Court, but to dismiss the appeal for want of prosecution.
- 3) Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-

Prashant Kumar Mishra

Judge

Gowri