

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.1180 of 2024

=====

Bhusan Kumar Singh son of Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of village-
Urdina, P.O.- Urdina, P.S.- Barun, District- Aurangabad (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Land Reform Department, Govt.of Bihar
2. The Registrar Civil Court, Aurangabad (Bihar)
3. Prasidh Narayan Singh son of late Harihar Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
4. Phulkeshwari Devi wife of Jitendra singh @ Jitendra Kumar Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
5. Shila Singh D/O Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
6. Dhanwanti Devi Wife of Narendra Kumar Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
7. Tejendra Kumar Singh son of Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
8. Ajit Kumar Singh S/O Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
9. Narendra Kumar Singh S/o Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of Village Urdina, P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).
10. Jitendra Kumar Singh son of late Prasidh Narayan Singh resident of Village Urdina P.S. Barun, District Aurangabad (Bihar).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kumar Pankaj, AC to SC-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 18-03-2025

The present petition has been filed seeking direction to
the authority concerned to make necessary correction in Award
dated 12.12.2015 passed by Presiding Officer, National Lok



Adalat held in Civil Court, Aurangabad in Partition Suit No. 386 of 2012.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and respondent nos. 3 to 10 were parties in the National Lok Adalat which was held on 12.12.2015 in Civil Court, Aurangabad and was presided over by learned Sub Judge-IV. With the consent of the parties a compromise petition was filed and Partition Suit No. 386 of 2012 was disposed of in the light of compromise of the parties. Learned counsel further submits that, however, it was noticed that due to clerical and typing error in Schedule of the properties, some plots and khata numbers were wrongly mentioned. Thereafter, a petition was filed by the parties to make necessary correction the Schedule of the properties. Learned counsel further submits that the original compromise petition was filed before the learned trial court on 14.07.2015 and thereafter on 09.12.2015, another petition with regard to Schedule of the properties was filed but the National Lok Adalat did not take notice of the subsequent corrected compromise petition dated 09.12.2015 and only the compromise petition dated 14.07.2015 was made part of the Award. Learned counsel fairly concedes that, however, no petition has been filed before the National Lok Adalat after the Award was passed



on 12.12.2015.

3. Having perused the record, I am of the opinion tht the petitioner has approached this Court with completely vague submission and on misplaced ground. If the original compromise petition was filed on 14.07.2015 and thereafter amended compromise petition was filed on 09.12.2015 and the Award was passed by the National Lok Adalat on 12.12.2015, the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that the National Lok Adalat has not been making correction in the Award is without any substance. From perusal of Award it appears that the joint compromise petition was made part of the Award. The petitioner should have taken the matter with the National Lok Adalat that the subsequent petition should also have been made part of the Award if it was found that the parties have voluntarily settled the matter and filed the subsequent compromise petition. But the petitioner did not take any step towards the same. So filing of the present civil miscellaneous petition is premature.

4. For the aforesaid reason, I do not find any merit in the present petition. However, the petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate steps permissible under the law for redressal of his grievance.



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

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	19.03.2025
Transmission Date	NA

