

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL REVISION No.37 of 2022

=====

Sudha Devi wife of Ganga Prasad Sah, resident of Village- Muraitha, Police Station - Galley, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Surendra Prasad Sah son of Gauri Shankar Sah, Resident of Village - Muraitha, P.S. - Galley, District - Darbhanga.
2. Arun Kumar Sah Son of Gauri Shankar Sah, Resident of Village - Muraitha, P.S. - Galley, District - Darbhanga.
3. Anita Devi wife of Atin Mahto, resident of Village- Bhagwatipur, P.S. - Pandaul, District - Madhubani.
4. Bina Devi Wife of Jamuna Prasad Sah, Resident of Village - Muraitha, P.S. - Galley, District - Darbhanga.
5. Kumar Sanjay Raushan Son of Late Jamuna Prasad Sah, Resident of Village - Muraitha, P.S. - Galley, District - Darbhanga.
6. Raj Rani Devi Wife of Pradip Mahto, resident of Village and Post - Supaul, P.S. - Biraul, District- Darbhanga.
7. Rajshree Devi Wife of Vikash Purbay, resident of Village and Post -Rosea, P.S. -Rosea, District- Samastipur.
8. Raj Laxmi wife of Ram Shankar Nayak, resident of village - Bhattmari Sarai, P.S. - Town, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Jitendra Prasad Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

20 19-12-2023 None appeared on behalf of the petitioner. On previous date also, none had appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent has submitted that this civil revision petition has been filed only with an intention to delay the execution proceeding of Execution Case



No. 10 of 2004 pending in the court of learned Munsif-II, Darbhanga. Learned counsel has submitted further that the petitioner is wife of judgment debtor who lost his case up to the second appeal. At the juncture of hearing of the second appeal at the stage of Order XLI Rule 11, it was argued by the petitioner that during pendency of that appeal, *Basgit Purcha* of the disputed land, granted in her favour, vide detailed order dated 21.06.2012 in Second Appeal No. 273 of 2004 preferred by husband of the petitioner, was dismissed by this Court at admission stage itself and while dismissing the appeal, the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant that the *Basgit Purcha* was obtained by wife of the appellant (petitioner), did not find favour for this Court.

3. The claim taken by the petitioner was already taken at the second appellate stage and the appeal was dismissed.

4. I do not find any merit in the present revision petition. Accordingly, it is dismissed.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Kundan/Shweta

U			
---	--	--	--

