

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**FIRST APPEAL No.638 of 1976**

- 
- 
4. Hardeo Yadav Son of Sadhu Yadav Resident of Mouza Bhadaur, Pergana Bhala, Police Station Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 5.1. Umesh yadav @ Umesh Chandra Yadav Son of Late Sahdeo Yadav, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 5.2. Ram Sakal Yadav Son of late Sahdeo Yadav, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jaynagar, District Madhubani.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. Shibjee Yadav Son of Jagdeo Yadav, deceased, Resident of Mouza Bhadaur, Pergana Bhala, Police Station Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 3.1. Most. Punam Devi W/o Late Dhanpati Yadav @ Panpati , Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 3.2. Manish Yadav Son of late Dhanpati Yadav @ Panpati, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 3.3. Satish yadav @ Satish Kumar Yadav, Son of Late Dhanpati yadav @ Panpati, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
- 4.1. Most. Orhulla Devi W/o Late Lakhpati Yadav, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jainagar, District Madhubani.
- 4.2. Laloo Yadav Son of late lakhpati Yadav, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jainagar, District Madhubani.
- 4.3. Lalit Yadav Son of Late Lakhpati Yadav, Resident of Village - Bhadaur, Police Station - Jainagar, District Madhubani.
- 4.4. Bibha Devi D/o late Lakhpati Yadav and W/o Rambaran Yadav, Resident of Village - Parsa, P.S. Jainagar, District- Madhubani.
- 4.5. Subhira Devi D/o late Lakhpati Yadav and W/o Kishun Yadav, Resident of Village - Gangora, P.S. Harlakhi, District- Madhubani.
5. Umesh Yadav Son of Sahdeo Yadav, Resident of Mouza Bhadaur, Pergana Bhala, Police Station Jaynagar, District Madhubani.
8. Dilip Yadav Son of Rambriksha Yadav, Resident of Mouza Bhadaur, Pergana Bhala, Police Station Jaynagar, District Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

---

---

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                  |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For the Appellant/s  | : | Mr. Bhubneshwar Prasad, Advocate |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Gopal Jha, Advocate          |
|                      |   | Mr. Shree Pal Jha, Advocate      |
|                      |   | Mr. Tushar Anand, Advocate       |

---

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**



48 21-11-2025

**I.A. No. 09 of 2024**

It has been submitted that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, Fresh Joint Compromise duly attested with signature and thumb impression of the respected parties of this appeal is being filed for consideration and for passing compromise decree agreed by the parties as mentioned in the compromise petition.

2. It has been submitted that both parties have compromised outside the court with the intervention of the well wishers, relatives and friends and further, they do not want to proceed with the aforesaid appeal. Both parties want to dispose of the ***F.A. No. 638 of 1976*** in terms of the compromise dated 03.06.2022.

3. It has further been submitted that both parties have partitioned their properties with the intervention of the well-wishers, relatives and friends for which a deed of partition has been made in presence of both parties and parties have put their signatures as well as thumb impressions on the said deed of partition with sweet will and without fear and pressure of anyone and the same has been prepared on 03.06.2022. The photocopy of the said Deed of partition dated 03.06.2022 is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure-A/1 to this



Interlocutory Application. After preparation of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022, both parties will not make objection and accordingly their legal heirs would also not be objected in future.

4. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Shibjee Yadav (Respondent no.1) has allotted the Schedule-1 of the properties who will come in possession of his respective properties which is situated in Mauza Bhadaur, P.S. Deodha, District- Madhubani.

5. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Punam Devi has allotted the Schedule-2 of the properties who will come in possession of her respective properties which is situated in Mauza Bhadaur P.S. Deodha, Anchal-Jai Nagar, District-Madhubani.

6. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Ahilya Devi has allotted the Schedule-3 of the properties who will come in the possession of her respective properties which is situated in Mauza-Bhadaur, P.S. Deodha, Anchal-Jainagar, District-Madhubani.

7. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Sahdeo Yadav @Ghuran Yadav has allotted the Schedule-4 of the properties who will come in possession



of his respective properties which is situated in Mauza-Bhadaur, Anchal-Jainagar, District- Madhubani.

8. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Haridev Yadav has allotted the Schedule-5 of the properties who will come in possession of his respective properties which is situated in Mauza-Bhadaur, P.S. Deodha, Anchal-Jainagar, District-Madhubani.

9. In terms of Memorandum of compromise petition dated 03.6.2022 Schedule-6 properties will be remained in the Joint possession of both the parties which are also situated in Mauza-Bhadaur, P.S. Deodha, District-Madhubani.

10. Perused the compromise petition and from perusal of the compromise petition, it appears that both parties have settled their matter amicably on the intervention of their well wishers, friends and relatives duly attested with signature and thumb impressions. Both parties will fully abide by the compromise decree passed on the basis of compromise petition (Annexure-A/1).

11. Considering the above facts and circumstances as stated above in the compromise petition, this appeal *i.e.*, ***FA. No. 638 of 1976*** is allowed in view of ***I.A. No. 09 of 2024***.

12. This compromise shall be the part of decree.



13. In result, this appeal *i.e.*, ***F.A. No. 638 of 1976*** stands allowed in terms of the compromise.

14. Office is directed to draw a decree and to remit the record back to the learned trial court.

**(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)**

Shubham/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

