

1
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT GWALIOR
BEFORE**

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR-IV

ON THE 11th OF JANUARY, 2024

MISC. PETITION No. 2101 of 2018

BETWEEN:-

**SMT. NISHA BHARGAVA W/O SHRI RAMKUMAR
BHARGAVA, AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, OCCUPATION:
HOUSEWIFE, R/O LATERI, MOHALLAH, NEAR BHINDA
TEHSIL LATERI DISTRICT VIDISHA (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(SHRI PAWAN DEWNANI - ADVOCATE)

AND

**1) SMT. VIMLA BAI D/O SHIVCHARANLAL, AGED
ABOUT 55 YEARS, OCCUPATION: HOUSEWIFE, R/O
VILLAGE GALAKHEDA TEHSIL LATERI, VIDISHA
(MADHYA PRADESH)**

**2) SMT. RAMSHREE BAI D/O SHIVCHARANLAL,
D/O LATE SHRI PREMNARAYAN, AGED ABOUT 60
YEARS, OCCUPATION: HOUSE WIFE, R/O VILLAGE
KACHIKHEDA, TEHSIL LATERI DISTRICT
VIDISHA (MADHYA PRADESH)**

**3) LADO BAI D/O SHIVCHARANLAL, W/O
BAMARLAL, AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS,
OCCUPATION: HOUSEWIFE, R/O VILLAGE
JAMNER, AT PRESENT VILLAGE ANANDPUR,
TEHSIL LATERI DISTRICT VIDISHA (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

**4) SALAKRAM S/O SHRI SHIVCHARAN LAL, AGE
70 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL
LATERI, DISTRICT VIDISHA**

**5) MADANMOHAN S/O SHIVCHARAN LAL, AGE 60
YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL
LATARI DISTRICT VIDISHA**

**6) GOVARDHAN S/O BRIJMOHAN, AGE 50 YEARS,
R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL LATARI,
DISTRICT VIDISHA**

**7) GUDDI BAI D/O BRIJMOHAN, WD/O MUNNU,
AGED 45 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR,**

TEHSIL LATARI, DISTRICT VIDISHA

8) PUSPA BAI, D/O BRIJMOHAN, WD/O OMPRAKASH, AGED 40 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL LATARI, DISTRICT VIDISHA

9) SHIPRABAI D/O BRIJMOHAN, W/O ASHOK, AGED 35 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL LATARI, DISTRICT VIDISHA

10) RAJESHBABU S/O SHRI SALAKRAM, AGED 35 YEARS, R/O VILLAGE ANANDPUR, TEHSIL LATARI, DISTRICT VIDISHA

11) STATE OF M.P. THROUGH COLLECTOR, DISTRICT VIDISHA

....RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI G. K. AGRAWAL - GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE)

This petition coming on for hearing this day, the court passed the following:

ORDER

Learned counsel for petitioner submits that he has no instructions from his client but from enquiry made from E-Court Services, it appears that case has already been disposed of and judgment has been passed.

It appears that plaintiff has no interest in pursuing the petition that is why he has not contacted his client.

In view of the above, petition is **dismissed as infructuous**. However, if any interest of petitioner still survives, he is at liberty to move an application for recalling the order.

(RAJENDRA KUMAR-IV)
JUDGE

Rohit