IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.4293 of 2025

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5271 of 2017

CNR No. BRHC011348452025

==========

Vakil Manjhi Son of Late Sbha Manjhi, Resident of Village- Jakhua, P.O.- Dewaria, P.S.- Revilganj, District- Saran at Chapra, formerly posted as Sub-Inspector of Police at Jaipur O.P. Incharge, P.S.- Katoria, District Banka.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Home Department, Ministry of Home Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat Building, Patna.
3. The Director General-Cum-Inspector General of Police, Bihar, Old Secretariat Building, Patna.
4. The Zonal Inspector General of Police, Bhagalpur Zone, Bhagalpur.
5. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Bhagalpur Range, Bhagalpur.
6. The Superintendent of Police, Banka, District- Banka.
7. Kanhaiya Lal, Son of Sri Ram Bah Prasad, Resident of Village- Ladaura, P.O. and P.S.- Kurhni, District- Muzaffarpur.
8. Bijendra Kumar Das, Son of Late Ramji Prasad, Resident of Village- Dihara, P.O.- Sirsi Dihara, P.S.- Harnaut, District- Nalanda at Biharsharif.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms.Riya Giri, Adv.
For the UOI	:	Mr.Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, Sr. CGC Mr.Brajesh Kr. Pandey, CGC
For the respondents	:	Mr.Rajan, Adv. Mr.Shashank Shekhar Dubey, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Saroj Kr. Sharma, AC to AAG3

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

7 30-10-2026 Learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State, learned counsel for the Union of India and learned counsel for the respondent No.7 & 8 are present.

2. The present MJC application has been filed for restoration of C.W.J.C. No.5271 of 2017, which was dismissed due to non prosecution vide order dated 06.05.2025.

WEB COPY

3. Learned counsel for the private opposite parties submits that though in the C.W.J.C. No.5271 of 2017, there were three petitioners and only one of them has opted to file restoration. The rest two petitioners of writ petition are opposite parties in the present MJC application. Counsel for opposite parties further submits that if the writ petition shall be restored then the private opposite parties shall have no adverse interest with the writ petitioner, who filed MJC (restoration) petition. It has been jointly submitted by counsel for private opposite parties that upon restoration of MJC petition, counsel who has filed restoration shall contest the writ and they (private opposite parties of MJC) shall have no objection for the same. They also submit that they have instructed to their client to provide a fresh vakalatnama to defend the writ petition on behalf of them also.

4. In the light of the submissions made, the present MJC application is hereby allowed and C.W.J.C. No.5271 of 2017 is hereby restored to this original file.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Prakashmani/-

U			

WEB COPY