

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.935 of 2018

1. Chaina Devi wife of Dinesh Prasad Singh resident of Mohalla- Line Par Mierzapur, P.S. and District- Nawada.
2. Basanti Devi wife of Baleshwar Prasad Singh resident of Mohalla- Line Par Mierzapur, P.S. and District- Nawada.
3. Manoj Ram @ Manoj Singh resident of Mohalla- Line Par Mierzapur, P.S. and District- Nawada.
4. Kiran Devi wife of Munna Singh resident of Mohalla- Line Par Nawada, P.S. and District- Nawada.
5. Muni Devi wife of Uttam Singh resident of Village- Dhamaul, P.S.- Hasua, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Collector-Cum District Magistrate, Nawada, at P.S. and District- Nawada.
2. The Anchal Adhikari, Nawada at Anchal Office- Nawada, P.S. and District- Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Devendra Prasad Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raj Kishore Roy, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 08-09-2022 Heard the parties.

2. By the impugned order dated 22.05.2018 passed in Title Appeal No. 09/2015 the learned District Judge, Nawada has rejected the prayer of the petitioners to mark *Hukumnamas* produced by them as exhibit.

3. Mr. Devendra Prasad Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are appellants in the lower appellate court and the *Hukumnamas* produced by them



was marked as 'X' and 'X/1' for identification, however, the appellants have deposited impounding fee of Rs. 2,321/- through civil *Chalan*, as such both the *Hukumnamas* ought to have been marked as exhibits by the learned lower appellate court.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State submits that the *Hukumnamas* produced by the appellants are not the public documents.

5. From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that the learned lower appellate court has refused to mark the *Hukumnamas* as exhibits on the ground that these are not the public documents.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners has failed to show any provision that the *Hukumnamas* are the public documents.

7. Accordingly, I do not find any irregularity in the order impugned. The application stands dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

