

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1128 of 2020

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10610 of 2006

=====

Krishna Devi, wife of Late Raghunath Jaiswal, Resident of 6H/37
Bahadurpur Housing Colony, P.O. - Lohiya Nagar P.S. Agam kuna Patna
District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar State Housing Board, Patna through its Chairman.
2. The Chairman, Bihar State Housing Board Patna.
3. The Managing Director, Bihar State Housing Board Patna.
4. The Estate officer cum joint Secretary, Bihar State Housing Board Patna.
5. The Revenue Officer, Bihar State Housing Board Patna.
6. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Housing Board Patna Division - 1
Hanuman Nagar, P.S. Patrakar Nagar District- Patna.
7. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary Housing Department
Govt. of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kunwar Ajit Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sanjeet Kumar Singh, AC to AAG-6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

4 02-03-2021

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State. Learned counsel for the petitioner hereby
undertakes to remove all defects pointed out by the Stamp
Reporter as and when required. It is accordingly directed that all
defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter be removed within
one month hereof.

2. The present petition has been filed for restoration of
C.W.J.C. No. 10610 of 2006 which was dismissed for want of
prosecution on 29.01.2013.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that



through inadvertence, the case was not marked on the cause list leading to non-appearance on behalf of the petitioner and finally resulting in dismissal of the writ petition.

4. This Court takes note however, that this is a old matter and the dismissal order was passed as far back as on 29.01.2013. The present restoration petition has thereafter been filed after an inordinate delay of almost 8 years on 14.12.2020. This Court is not satisfied with the casual explanation and without sufficient cause for the considerable delay of almost 8 years in approaching this Court for restoration of the writ petition and is thus not inclined to accede to the prayer of the petitioner. The restoration petition stands dismissed. Needless to say, the petitioner is always at liberty to seek redressal of her grievances before any forum as may be available to her in accordance with law.

5. Office shall follow-up to ensure that all defects are removed and compliance with the notices of this Court are made by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Ibrar//-

U			
---	--	--	--

