**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**
**Civil Review No. 141 of 2025**
---

Amit Kumar, aged about 40 years, son of Late Gopi Krishna Sahay, resident of Shastri Nagar, P.O.-Giridih, P.S.-Giridih (T), District-Giridih (Jharkhand)

... ... **Petitioner**

**Versus**

Anup Pastor, aged about 33 years, son of Late Pyarelal, resident of Airport Road Bora, P.O. & P.S.-Pachamba, District-Giridih.

… … **Opp. Party**

---

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA**

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Peeyush Krishna Choudhary, Advocate
Mr. Amrit Anunay, Advocate
Ms. Binita Sahay, Advocate

For the Opp. Party :

---

**Order No. 03/ Dated: 23rd April, 2026**

**I.A. No. 14347 of 2025**

1. This application has been preferred by the petitioner for condoning the delay of 37 days in filing the civil review, the details of which has been mentioned in paragraph No. 5, which appears to be sufficient.

2. Having been satisfied with the reasons assigned in the instant application, the same is allowed and the delay of 37 days in filing the civil review is hereby condoned.

3. Accordingly, I.A. No. 14347 of 2025 is allowed.

**Civil Review No. 141 of 2025**

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. It is submitted that in the impugned order passed in Civil Revision No. 22 of 2023 by this Court vide order dated 03.07.2025, there is observation in paragraph No.5 that ***"the injunction order passed by learned Trial Court under Order XXXIX Rule 1 & 2 read with Section 151 C.P.C. requires no interference. However, the petitioner/defendant***

***is claiming possession only over the area of 20 decimals of Khata No.11, Plot No.733 which has not to be affected by the order of injunction passed in favour of the plaintiff."***

6. The aforesaid observation is causing inconvenience to the plaintiff/petitioner in raising any construction over the plot appertaining to Khata No.7, Plot No. 733 measuring an area of 25 decimals, over which the injunction order has been passed. Therefore, the aforesaid observation is sought to be omitted from the earlier order passed by this Court.

7. It appears that the plea of the learned counsel for the petitioner is not related to any of the grounds mentioned for filing review application as per Order XLVII Rule 1 of the Code of Civil Procedure. There is no error apparent on record rather the point raised by learned counsel for the petitioner involves disputed questions of fact which have to be decided during trial. Therefore, I do not find any merit in the present review application and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

**(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)**

**23.04.2026**
Arpit
Uploaded on 25/04/2026