

(2)

Pr. 309/25

Anted
28/04/25

one in search of purchaser.
That the now suit land is ^{not} partitioned
in spite of that defendant try
to sell disputed land. That if
suit land will be sell to land
mafia then plaintiff/petitioner
will be suffer irreparable loss,
That prima facie and balance of
convenience is in favour of
petitioner. That plaintiff has
joined his chain of title in
his plaint.

Def No. 3 & 4 filed show cause
on dated 01/04/2024. That junction
petition as filed is beyond the
part and law. The defendant further
stated that the disputed land
belongs to the Shyam Wishore
Pandey. That Shyam Wishore Pandey
has named his both daughter
during his life. who are plaintiff No. 1.

30-

4 11

28/04/24

Antal and defendant No. 1. That after death of shyam kishore Pandey his property was inherited by his widow namely Vidya Devi. That when plaintiff and defendant defendant No. 1 required to make house, then defendant No. 2 with consent of plaintiff No. 1 and Def No. 1. sold ~~in~~ land in favour of Raj kishore Pandey through sale deed dated 06/06/2015. and she executed second sale deed on the same date dated 06/06/15 and 02 katta of dhur in favour of Ramayadhya Pandey. That on the basis of sale deed both Raj kishore Pandey and Ramayadhya Pandey came into possession on ~~the~~ above said land and also mutation of land done in their name and accordingly they are Antal

Contd-
28/2/14

paying revenue on land to the Court of Bihar. That Plaintiff has filed this petition with the influence of land mafia. Further defendant submitted that Plaintiff No. 1 and defendant No. 1 then sells sold defendant's No. 3 land area 1 katta 10 dhur through sale deed dated 06/09/2013 to Dwasine Pandey. That no bona fide case is made out in favour of Plaintiff's balance of convenience is also a not in favour of Plaintiff and also no irreparable loss to Plaintiff.

Heard both sides and perused record. On perusal of record it transpires that def No. 3 and def No. 4 are purchasers of def No. 2. It is also admitted the suit land is in the name of shyam kishore Pandey, husband of def No. 2, and father

R.S. 309/15

②⑤

Contd.
08/09/15

of Plaintiff No 1 and Defendant
No. 1. After death of Shyam
Wishore Pandey, Def No 2 widow
of Shyam Wishore Pandey sold
two plots in favour of Def
No 3 and 4. Mutation of the
purchased land was done in
the name of Def No. 3 and 4.
Both purchasers are in possession
of the land and they are
paying government rent also.
Hence prima facie case is not made
out in favour of Plaintiff. Also
Balance of convenience was made
out in favour of Def No. 3 & 4 &
also Plaintiff was not under irreparable
loss. Further Plaintiff No 1 and Def.
No 1. than self sold land to Dhanika
Pandey. Hence considering all facts
and circumstance petition of
injunction hereby rejected. Next
date _____ for further
proceeding

Manoj
Sub Judge.
Sonapur