

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.908 of 2017

=====

Sheikh Isarat Son of Late Sheikh Safi Resident of Mohalla - Karan Sarai, P.S.
P.O. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Saiyad Najeeb Ahmad son of Late Latif Ahmad
2. Smt. Asia Parveen Wife of Sayed Nazib Ahmad
3. Jiquddin Ahmad Son of Late Mohiuddin Ahmad All are residents of Mohalla
- Karan Sarai, P.O. P.S. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas.
4. Nehal Ahmad Son of Belal Ahmad
5. Jalal Ahmad son of Belal Ahmad All are residents of Mohalla - Idgah, Town
P.S. - Dehri, District - Rohtas.
6. Mahangai Lal Son of Gauri Shankar Halwai
7. Gopal Jee Son of Gauri Shankar Halwai Resident of Mohalla - Karan Sarai,
P.S. P.O. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas.
8. Madho Lal Son of Hiralal Halwai
9. Geeta Devi Wife of Parmanand Vishwakarma
10. Ramesh Prasad Jaiswal, Prop. Bajrang Engineering Works, Adda Road
Sasaram.
11. Khalil Ahmad Son of Imamuddin
12. Sultan Ahmad Son of Gulam Ali
13. Teju Mian Son of Lal Mohammad
14. Sheikh Khursid Son of Late Safi
15. Laila Khatoon Wife of Md. Kamran Resident of Mohalla - Karan Sarai, P.S.
P.O. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas.
16. The Chairman Sunni Waqf Board, Patna, S.P. Verma Road, Patna.
17. Rehana Khatun Wife of
18. Sheikh Shahjad Son of
19. Rinki Daughter of
20. Sheikh Azad Son of Late Sheikh Safi
21. Firoj Khan Son of
22. Dablu Khan Son of All are residents of Mohalla - Karan
Sarai, P.S. P.O. - Sasaram, District - Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====



Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. J.P. Singh, Advocate
Mr. Abhishek, Advocate
For Respondent No.6 : Md. Helal Ahmad, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 09-01-2024

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for respondent no. 16.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the present petition has been filed for setting aside the judgment dated 27.01.2017 passed by learned District Judge, Rohtas at Sasaram in Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No. 02 of 1997 rejecting the prayer of the petitioner for injunction on the suit property. However, considering the fact that the matter is an old one and needs to be disposed of as soon as possible, he is not pressing the relief as sought in the main petition. Learned counsel further submits that the learned trial court may be directed to dispose of the suit pending before it within a stipulated period since the suit has been pending since 1995.

3. I think the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted very fairly and for the fact that the suit is still pending after 28 years, it is duty of all concerned to see that such matters are decided and disposed of as soon as possible. Hence, learned Sub Judge-V, Rohtas at Sasaram is directed to dispose of the suit, i.e., Title Suit No. 379 of 1995 within a period of six



months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

4. Parties are directed to cooperate towards disposal in trial without taking unnecessary adjournments. The learned trial court is to ensure that unnecessary adjournments are not granted and if any party try to delay the disposal of the suit, appropriate order must be passed.

5. With the aforesaid observation and direction, the present petition stands disposed of.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	09.01.2024
Transmission Date	NA

