

Deputy Commissioner Ramgarh	...	...	Appellant
Versus			
Durjan Mahto and others	...	...	Respondent

For the Appellant : Mr. P.C. Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Jitesh Kumar, Advocate

2. As per the office note, notice has been personally served upon respondent nos. 3,6,10,13,14,17,18,19 and 21. So far as respondent nos. 1,2,4,5,8 and 11 are concerned, they have been served through their sons and notice upon respondent nos. 9,15 and 16 has been served through their brother.

3. Considering the fact that notice has been served either personally or through their close relatives, notice upon the aforesaid respondents is accepted as validly served.

4. Further, as per the office note, respondent nos. 7,12, and 20 have expired.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents has undertaken to provide the names of legal heirs and successors of respondent nos. 7,12 and 20 to the learned counsel for the appellant within one week from today.

6. The learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that records have already been called for in F.A. No. 70 of 2024 and therefore records are not to be called for again. However, the case is not ready for Admission.

7. It has been submitted that F.A. No. 71 of 2024 arising out of the same proceedings is fixed on 09.7.2025.

8. Post this case on 09.07.2025 under appropriate heading.