

IN THE COURT OF CIVIL JUDGE SENIOR DIVISION-I
District Civil Court, Lakhisarai

Title Suit No. 17 of 2007

Balmiki Paswan

.....**Plaintiff**

Versus

Babita Sinha & Ors.

.....**Defendants**

AND

Title Suit No. 66 of 2013

Manju Devi

.....**Plaintiff**

Versus

Chandrawati Devi & Ors.

.....**Defendants**

Ranjeet Kumar Sonu, CJSD-I

19.11.2025: Today, two case records, namely Title Suit No. 17 of 2007 and Title Suit No. 66 of 2013, were placed before me for consideration.

In Title Suit No. 17 of 2007, the plaintiff Balmiki Paswan seeks, inter alia, a declaration of title against ten defendants namely Babita Sinha, Mukesh Chaudhary, Ranju Devi, Chhittan Paswan, Anu Sinha, Kamli Devi, Sunaina Devi, Karuna Devi, Reena Devi and Chandrawati Devi in respect of the suit land described as: Mauja Kiul Mathar (Khagaur), Thana No. 122, Tauji No. 3132, Khata No. 499, Khesra Nos. 2127 & 2128, Area – 1 acre 28½ decimals, and Thana No. 125, Tauji No. 1286, Khata No. 82, Khesra No. 260, Area – 1 katha.

In Title Suit No. 66 of 2013, the plaintiff Manju Devi has sought a declaration of title against the defendants namely Chandrawati Devi, Krishnandan Paswan, Balmiki Paswan, Ritesh Drollia, Kamli Devi, Babita Sinha, Mukesh Chaudhary, Annu Sinha, Babita Devi, Jhilli Devi, Bina Sinha, Ranju Devi, Nupur Varma and Pinki Sinha in respect of the suit land described as: Mauja Kiul, Thana No. 122, Tauji No. 2132, Khata No. 499, Khesra Nos. 2127 & 2128, Area – 1 acre 28½ decimals.

Perused the record file. Upon perusal of both complaints and case records, the following facts are evident:

1. The suit lands in both suits substantially overlap, both involving Khata No. 499, Khesra Nos. 2127 & 2128, area 1 acre 28½ decimals, situated under Mauja Kiul / Kiul Mathar, Thana No. 122.
2. Common parties appear in both suits, including Balmiki Paswan, Chandrawati Devi, Babita Sinha, Mukesh Chaudhary, Ranju Devi, Kamli Devi, Annu Sinha, among others.
3. The core issue in both suits is the declaration of title over the same land, and separate trials may lead to conflicting decisions.
4. Joint trial would avoid multiplicity of proceedings, ensure judicial economy, and facilitate a comprehensive adjudication.

Accordingly, This court finds that both matters involve common questions of law and fact, attract the principles under Order II Rule 3 and Section 151 CPC, and therefore merit being tried together.

In the interest of justice, equity, and to avoid conflicting judgments, it is hereby ordered that:

1. Title Suit No. 17 of 2007 and Title Suit No. 66 of 2013 shall be amalgamated and tried together.
2. For administrative convenience, Title Suit No. 17 of 2007 shall be treated as the leading case, and evidence shall be recorded therein unless otherwise ordered.
3. The pleadings, documents, and evidence of both suits shall stand read in the amalgamated proceeding.
4. The office is directed to tag and consolidate both case records accordingly.

Put up the amalgamated record on 05.12.2025 for further orders.

(RANJEET KUMAR SONU)
Civil Judge Senior Division-I, Lakhisarai