

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2585 of 2016

In
CIVIL REVISION No.153 of 2013

=====

Lallan Prasad Gupta, son of Late Jagarnath Ram Kanu, Resident of Mohalla
Thatheri Bazar,Dumraon, P.S. Dumraon, District Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Dumraon Properties Enterprises through the Secretary Siya Sharan Singh son of Mithila Sharan Singh (Since Deceased), resident of Kokil, P.S.-Islampur,- Nalanda At Present resident of Dumraon, P.D.- Dumraon,District-Bhojpur, Buxar
2. Lakhan Prasad Gupta son of Late Bihari Prasad Gupta
3. Ganpati Prasad Gupta @ Ganpat Prasad,Son of Late Bihari Prasad Gupta
4. Bhola Prasad Gupta son of Late Bihari Prasad Gupta
5. Jai Prakash Gupta son of Late Bihari Prasad Gupta
6. Bimla Devi wife of Kanhaiya Prasad
7. Ashok Kumar Son of Kanhaiya Prasad
8. Meera Devi wife of Ishwar Dayal
9. Laxman Prasad Gupta @ Laxman Prasad son of Late Gagarnath Ram Kanu
10. Raj Kumar Gupta @ Raj Kumar Prasad son of Late Jagarnath Ram Kanu
11. Mithilesh Kumar @ Mukulesh Prasad Gupta
12. Prabhawati Wife of Ram Babu
13. Shanti Devi wife of Late Mohan Prasad
14. Lal Babu Gupta son of Late Brijmohan Prasad,
15. Gayatri Devi Daughter of Late Mohan Prasad
All resident of Mohalla Thatheri Bazar, Dumraon, P.S.-Dumraon, District-Buxar.
16. Arati Devi wife of Binod Kumar Gupta resident of village - Sonbarsa, P.S. Shahpur District- Bhojpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

ORAL ORDER

3 09-12-2021 The dispute emanating out of an execution petition filed in the year 1991, was raised by the petitioner by assailing the order dated 17.08.2013 in Civil Revision No. 153 of 2013, titled as **Lallan Prasad Gupta Vs. Dumraon Properties Enterprises & Ors.**, which stood dismissed in default on 30.06.2016 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

In the instant application, petitioner seeks recall of said order dated 30.06.2016. The averments made in the application do not warrant interference by this Court, for no ground sufficient enough stands made out in the application seeking restoration of the petition. Litigation must come to an end at some stage.

Hence, the present application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

Sujit/Ashwini

U			
---	--	--	--