

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1034 of 2022

-
1. Pawan Yadav son of late Upendra Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
 2. Sankar Yadav son of late Upendra Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
 3. Shyamdeo Yadav son of late Upendra Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
 4. Neti Lal Yadav son of late Jamun Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
 5. Uttim Lal Yadav son of late Jamun Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Triful Devi wife of late Moti Lal Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
2. Smt. Mina Kumari daughter of late Moti Lal Yadav Through her mother, natural Guardian and next friend Triful Devi, resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
3. Ramchandra Yadav S/o Anandi Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
4. Smt. Sudama Devi W/o Ramchandra Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
5. Niranjana Kumar minor S/o Ramchandra Yadav Through his father, guardian and next friend Ramchandra Yadav, resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
6. Sunil Kumar S/o Deonandan Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
7. Shashichandra Yadav S/o Deonandan Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.
8. Lalan Kumar S/o Deonandan Yadav resident of Village Kapasia Tola Kamalgari, PS Saur Bazar, District Saharsa.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhav Roy
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 14-09-2023

1. This case has come under the heading “To be



Mentioned”.

2. It seems that the office note dated 13.09.2023 is misconceived.

3. Once the restoration application was allowed, there was no need for the office to point out that the limitation petition is pending.

4. Let it be deemed that the final order was passed after condoning the delay.

5. This application is consigned.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

