

Court No. - 68

Case :- WRIT - B No. - 25023 of 1993

Petitioner :- Jai Prakash

Respondent :- Board Of Revenue

Counsel for Petitioner :- Anil Bhushan, Navin Yadav, Vivek Kumar Srivastava, Vivek Srivastava

Counsel for Respondent :- S.C., B.B. Paul, P.K. Pathak, Rajesh Kr. Sharma

Hon'ble Saumitra Dayal Singh, J.

Re: Civil Misc. Substitution Application No. 186521 of 2012

1. This is an application for substitution of respondent no.4, who has died.
2. At present, no objection appears to exist to the said application.
3. The substitution application is thus **allowed**.
4. Let, the words 'since deceased' be added against the name of respondent no.4 and, in his place, his legal heirs, as described in paragraph no.2 of the affidavit filed in support of the substitution application, be substituted as respondent nos.4/1, 4/2, 4/3 and 4/4.
5. Necessary substitution be incorporated within a week.

Re: Civil Misc. Substitution Application No.381450 of 2017

6. There appears to exist a reference of details of order dated 18.01.2018 passed on several substitution and other applications on **civil misc. substitution application no.81261 of 2008**. However, the order dated 18.01.2018 is not available on the order sheet. Office to trace out the order dated 18.01.2018 and place it on record, a copy of which is stated to be available on the website of the Court.

Order On Petition:-

7. List revised. None is present on behalf of the respondents.
8. Heard Sri Y.S. Bohra, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State.

9. Office report dated 13.02.2020 reveals that notice dispatched on the substitution application have neither been returned nor acknowledgement has been received back service.

10. List in the next cause list on non hearing day, **showing the name** of Sri Rajesh Sharma, as counsel for the respondents.

Order Date :- 14.2.2020
Shubham