

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st

Bagaha West Champaran

Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024

Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs

Vs

Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Date Of Order	Order with initials of P.O	Remarks
<u>05.02.2026</u>	Attendance has been filed by both the parties . Heard both parties. A petition under order 39 Rule 1 & 2 C.P.C has been filed on behalf of the plaintiff on 07-04-2025 . The rejoinder has been filed on behalf of defendant no. 4 to 7 on 07-04-2025 by Defendant no 1 to 3 & on 09-10-2025 by Defendant no 4 to 7. Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff has submitted that this suit has been filed on behalf of plaintiff for right, title & confirmation of possession of the plaintiff over the suit land. The case of the plaintiff in brief is that jamabandi no. 65 with respect to property mentioned in the schedule I of the plaint was running at the name of Sri Yugul Prasad who purchased this land on 23.05.1925 through a registered sale deed executed by Shanichar Chaudhary & Tapi Chaudhary jointly. Further Yugul Sah & his brother Suraj Prasad Sah orally partitioned the properties amicably. And the properties mentioned in schedule I of the plaint were allotted in the share of Suraj Prasad Sah and thus jamabandi no. 65 was transferred in the name of Suraj Prasad Sah. Further the plaintiff has contended that the Suraj Sah transferred the suit land through a registered gift deed on 07.09.1962 to his son Raj Kishor Prasad. That the defendants No 1 started to falsely claim over the suit land branding him as heir of the recorded tenant firstly attempted to create jamabandi in his name by making representation in “Janta Darbar” of Chief Minister against Yugul Sah, the original jamabandi holder of joint family of plaintiffs which was transferred to D.C.L.R, Bagaha for action in to the matter who quite surreptitiously without giving any notice passed an order u/s 4 of B.L.D.R. Act and there after an appeal was	

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd.... 05.02.2026	preferred by Yugul Prasad before commissioner Tirhut Division under the Act from where the case was remanded back to D.C.L.R, Bagaha for proper disposal according to law and ultimately after full hearing D.C.L.R, Bagaha passed his order in favour of the family of plaintiffs rejecting the prayer of the defendant Ram Keshwar Chaudhary leading to cancellation of jamabandi case No 143/2021-22 by defendant no 1 before Additional Collector defendant no 5 which is subject matter of an appeal now before District Collector, West Champaran being jamabandi cancellation Appeal Case no 83/2023-24 still pending before Collector, West Champaran but once again quite illegally Additional Collector, West Champaran Bettiah in collusion with defendant no 1 got started a fresh jamabandi cancellation case no 192/2023-24 over same lands and has illegally passed his final order on 29-03-2025 against the plaintiffs quite surreptitiously without taking any care for all the relavant documents filed by the plaintiffs and has cancelled the jamabandi of the family of plaintiffs running since the prior to the vesting of estate where as not a single document was ever filed on behalf of defendants no 1 to 3 before him against which the humble plaintiffs have already submitted their documents to their learned Advocate at Bettiah to file appeal before Collector West Champaran. The plaintiff while pressing the injunction petition the plaintiff has prayed that on the basis of illegal order passed by the court of L.R.D.C. on 29.03.2025 in jamabandi cancellation no. 192/2023-24 the defendants no. 1 to 3 are trying to sale the suit land mentioned in schedule I of the plaint on nominal value therefore, they have prayed that the defendats be restrined from alenating the suit land till the disposal of the suit. Per contra, the defendant no 1 to 3 has filed	
--	--	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	their rejoinder on 07.04.2025 stating that this injunction petition is not maintainable either in the eye of law or fact. They have denied the fact that the suit land was gifted to the father of the plaintiff through a registered document on 07.09.1962 on which jamabandi no. 65 is running on the name of his father. Further the defendants no. 1 to 3 has also denied the fact that the said land was purchased by Yugul Sah from Shanichar Chaudhry and Tapi Chaudhry on 23.05.1925 by a registered sale deed. Further they have also denied the fact that the said land was partitioned between Yugul Sah and Suraj Sah and Suraj Sah was given property mentioned in schedule I of the plaint. Further they have also denied the fact that the said land was gifted by Suraj Sah to his son Raj Kishor Prasad and jamabandi no. 65 was created in the name of Raj Kishor Prasad. Further they have also denied the fact that the order by Collector in jamabandi cancelation case no. 143/2021 & 22 is illegal and wrong. Further they have asserted that Collector has given his judgement on the basis of report of C.O. Bagaha 2 after duly haering both the parties. Further defendant no. 1 to 3 hjas contended that the real story is that Plot no. 88, measuring 8 bigha, 18 katha & 18 dhur situated in Maza- Balua. This land is equally registered in the name of Shanichar Cahudhry in one sahre and Medhu and pahun S/O Tetar Chauhdry in one share. In the same manner the total land of plot no. 9 is registered in the anme of Dhab, S/O Munsu Cahudhry in one share and Mishri & Tiwari in one share. Further they have admitted the fact that ancestors of Ramkeshwar Chauhdry was the khatuyani Raiyat and no sale deed was executed by them till date. Therefore, there is no chance of any sale deed executed by them in the favour of plaintiff. And further it has been stated by the plaintiff that	
---	--	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	a false jamabandi was created in the favour of plaintiff by the circle office dishonestly and on receiving the information about the same the Defendants filed a cancellation case in front of L.R.D.C. in which jamabandi of the plaintiff was cancelled. Further they have contended that the ancestor of plaintiff Yugul Prasad filed a appeal for land rectification before the commissioner, Muzaffarpur in which the case no. 64/2011 was remanded back in the court of district collector on which he initiated rectification case no. 57/2012-13 and called a report from the circle officer and in respect to plot no. 9 in which he submitted the case is pending in the court of Munsif, Bagaha and thus ended the suit in this manner. Further the defendant has contended that on jamabandi cancellation suit was filed before Collector in which while receiving report from circle officer, Bagaha 2 jamabandi no. 65 was cancelled by the Additional Collector on being satisfied that such jamabandi has been dishonestly created in the favour of the plaintiff. Therefore, the plaintiff did not had any title over the suit land . A show cause has also been filed on behalf of defendant no. 4 to 7 on 07.04.2025 in which they have contended that this suit has been filed by the plaintiff to escape from the order passed by additional collector, Bettiah in Jamabandi cancellation case no. 192/2023-24. The plaintiffs challenged the order dated 29.03.2025 passed by additional collector vide R.M. Appeal o. 7/2025-26 before the collector, West Champaran Bettiah which is still pending. Further they have contended that it is admitted fact that jamabandi no. 65 was created in the name of Rajkishor Prasad of which the rent receipts were issued by circle office, Bagaha-2. Further in the year 2011 a dispute arised between defendant 1st party and ancesstors of plaintiff in which the B.L.D.R. Case no.	
---	---	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	57/2012-13 was filed by Ramkeshwar Mahto in the court of D.C.L.R. Bagaha and that instant case was remanded back by the commissioner vide letter no 443 dated 21.06.2012 in which the petitioner Ramkeshwar Chaudhary failed to submit any relevant document with respect to plot no. 88 & 9 and it was also found that a title suit 46/2003 was pending in the court of Munsif. In that instant case it was held by D.C.L.R. that the petitioner Ramkeshwar Chaudhary was making claims that he was the heirs of Sanichar Chaudhary. The opposite parties were contesting the case on the basis of Registered sale deed of 1925 on which the jamabandi was running on the name of Yugul Prasad. Considering the fact that T.S. 46/2003 was already pending in the court of Munsif. Further they have contended that plaintiff have filed R.M. Case no. 7/2025-26 before the collector and has concurrently filed this title suit on the basis of registered sale deed dated 23.05.2025 executed by Sanichar Chaudhary and Tapi Chaudhary in favour of Yugul Sah whereas the defendant 1st party is claiming the property as legal heirs of khatiyani Raiyat Sanichar Chaudhary. The following three tests had been laid down for consideration by the court while granting the temporary injunction. I. Prima facie case II. Balance of convenience. III. Irreparable loss. In Dalpat Kumar Vs Prahlad Singh (1992) 1 SCC 719, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the phrases 'Prima facie Case' "balance of convenience" and "irreparable loss" are not rhetoric phrases for incantation but words of width and elasticity, intended to meet myriad situations presented by men's ingenuity in given facts and	
---	---	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	circumstances and should always be hedged with sound exercise of judicial discretion to meet the ends of justice. The Courts should be circumspect before granting the injunction and look to the conduct of the party, the probable injury to either party and whether the plaintiff could be adequately compensated if injunction is refused. (I) Prima Facie Case Firstly, the point of determination is that whether the petitioner had any prima facie case in his favour. The word prima facie case is not same as prima facie title. Prima facie case is a substantial question raised bonafide which needs investigation & decision on merit. The Court has to be satisfied that there is a serious question to be tried at the hearing of the suit & every probability titles in his favour of the relief sought for. In the present case the plaintiff has claimed the title to the suit land by virtue of registered sale deed dated 23.05.1925 executed by Sanichar Cahuhdry and Tapi Chauhdry to Yugul Prasad who is the decendant of the plaintiff where as the defendants have claim their title on the basis of coparcenary property to which they assert that the Sanchiar Chauhdry was his common ancesstor and also that he never executed any sale deed in favour Jugul Prasad. From the perusal of record it is evident that the plaintiff has filed the certified copy of the sale deed which is on record in support of his claim. The matter of dispute in the case is that the plaintiff has claimed his title & possession over the suit land on the basis of sale deed executed in the year 1925 by the ancestors of Defendant No. 1 to3 and has also asserted the fact that the suit land is in the possession of the plaintiff. where as the defendant has denied the execution of any such sale deed and has	
---	--	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	claimed their possession as the legal heirs of Shanichar Chaudhary considering the above facts & circumstances and also the fact that plaintiffs has claimed is possession on the basis of sale deed executed by Shanichar Chaudhary & Tapi Chaudhary and defendant no 1 to 3 has not brought any fact till now to prove that the said deed is forged & fabricated and further this is a matter of trial. Therefore, the prima facie case is decided in the favour of plaintiff. (II) Balance of inconvenience – The court has to compare the case of the parties & the comparative mischief or inconvenience & see whether the inconvenience caused from withholding the injunction will be greater than which is likely to arrive from granting it. Considering the point of balance of convenience this court finds that this suit has been filed for declaration of right, title, interest & confirmation of possession & the plaintiff is in possession over the suit land. Hence, in the light of aforesaid discussion, the court finds that petitioner has established the fact that the balance of convenience is in the favour of plaintiff/petitioner. Therefore, the balance of convenience is also decided in the favour of plaintiff. (III) Irreparable loss – This implies that the injury must be material one that cannot be adequately compensated in terms of money. In simple term it means that non-interference by the court it will result into irreparable injury to the party seeking relief & that there is no other remedy available to the parties except the one to grant injunction. In the instant case, if the injunction is not allowed there is chance of alienation of suit land by defendant no. 1 to 3. While any such transfer would be subject to section 52 of Transfer of property act it can lead	
---	---	--

In the Court of Sub Judge 1st
Bagaha West Champaran
Title Suit-61/2024 CIS No- 64/2024
Abhay Shankar Prasad and Others.....Plaintiffs
Vs
Ram Keshwar Chaudhary and Others.....Defendants

Contd..... 05.02.2026	to further litigation on this instant suit land. Therefore, this issue is also decided in the favour of plaintiff. Irreparable loss however does not mean that there must be no possibility of repairing the injury but means only that the injury must be material one. Further more, order 39 Rule 1 deals with cases where any property in dispute in a suit is in danger of being wasted, damaged or alienated by any party to the suit. The court may be order grant a temporary injunction to restrain such act or make such other order for the purpose of staying & preventing the wasting, damaging, alienation, sale, removal or disposition of property. In light of aforementioned discussions, this court finds it a fit case to grant injunction. Therefore, the petition of plaintiff is allowed & both the parties are directed not to alienate the suit land. Further the plaintiff is directed to complete its evidence within six months failing to which the order of injunction will automatically vacate. Send the copy or letter of this order to concern Police Station for maintaining the status quo. Put up on 20.02.2026 for further proceeding. (Dictated & Corrected) Sub Judge Ist Bagaha West Champaran	
--	---	--