(2026:JHHC:31944)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
C.M.P. No. 1117 of 2024

Bhuneshwari Devi, aged about 76 years, wife of Radhe Shyam Agrawal, resident of Village Pratappur, P.O. and P.S. – Pratappur, District –Chatra, at present residing at Village – Kasmar, P.O. and P.S. Pratappur, District –Chatra.

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

1. Sachidanand Prasad Agrawal, son of late Gupteshwar Agrawal
2. Arun Agrawal, Son of late Gupteshwar Agrawal
3. Krishna Devi, wife of Janardhan Agrawal
4. Anup Kumar Agrawal
5. Om Prakash Agrawal
6. Vikash Kumar Agrawal

   Nos. 4 to 6 sons of Late Janardhan Agrawal
7. Gita Kumari
8. Pramila Kumari

   Nos. 7 and 8 daughters of Late Janardhan Agrawal
9. Vijay Kumar Agrawal, son of Late Janardhan Agrawal

   All residents of Village Kasmar, P.O. and P.S. Pratappur, District –Chatra at present residing at Village Kunda, Near Murlidhar Mandeer, P.O. and P.S. Kunda, District -Chatra
10. Gyanchand Agrawal
11. Subhas Chandra Agrawal

    Nos. 10 to 11 sons of Late Krishna Chandra Agrawal
12. Manju Devi, daughter of Krishna Chandra Agrawal
13. Umashankar Agrawal, son of Late Gulab Sao
14. Bablu Agrawal, son of Umashankar Agrawal
15. Chandan Agrawal, son of Umashankar Agrawal
16. Chanchal Agrawal, son of Umashankar Agrawal

    Nos. 10 to 16 residents of Village Kasmar, P.O. and P.S. Pratappur, District –Chatra. .... Opp. Parties

------

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amar Kr. Sinha, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate

Order No.05 Dated- 30.10.2026

Heard the parties.

This civil miscellaneous petition has been filed at the instance of the petitioner for restoration of S.A. No. 14 of 2023 to its original file.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that S.A. No. 14 of 2023 was dismissed for non-compliance of the peremptory order of this Court dated 08.08.2023 whereby petitioner who was the appellant therein was directed to remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within eight weeks. It is next submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that due to bonafide mistake the counsel appearing for the appellant could not remove the defects within the stipulated time resulting in dismissal of the said S.A. No. 14 of 2023. It is next submitted that the petitioner has very good grounds to agitate in the said S.A. No. 14 of 2023 and unless S.A. No. 14 of 2023 is restored to its original file, the petitioner will be highly prejudiced. Hence, it is submitted that S.A. No. 14 of 2023 be restored to its original file.

Considering the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner, S.A. No. 14 of 2023 is restored to its original file to the stage at which, it was before its dismissal.

List S.A. No. 14 of 2023 under the appropriate heading after a week before the appropriate Bench.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

30.10.2026
Sonu-