

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3851 of 1988

=====

Sumitra Devi daughter of late Deo Muni Singh, wife of Kapur Chand
Singh, resident of Village- Uttardahan, P.S. Jagdishipur, District- Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bishwanath Singh
2. Shiv Nath Singh, both sons late Khedan Yadav.
3. Dhaniya Devi W/O late Ram Nihora Singh.
4. Raj Keshri Devi
5. Chanmuni Devi
6. Lal Munia
7. Balmunia, all daughters of late Ram Nihora Singh, all resident of
Village- Uttardahan, P.S. Jagdishipur, District- Bhojpur
8. The Assistant Consolidation Officer, Jagdishipur, P.S. Jagdishpur,
District Bhojpur
9. The Consolidation Officer, Jagdishpur, P.S. Jagdishpur, District-
Bhojpur
10. The Assistant Director, Consolidation, Bhojpur, District- Bhojpur
11. The Dy. Director, Consolidation, Bihar, Patna.
12. The State of Bihar

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None.

For the Respondent/s : None.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-10-2015 The present matter has been coming on the board for the last several dates, and since none is appearing on behalf of the petitioner, therefore, the matter is being passed over every day by oral order(s). Even today when the matter has been called out, none appears on behalf of the petitioner in support of the present writ petition, though the name of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is printed in the daily cause list. None appears on behalf of the respondents either.

On examination of the record of the case, this Court finds that the present writ petition stood dismissed way back in the year 1988 as against the respondent no. 1 to 7 on account of non-

compliance of the Court’s peremptory order dated 04.07.1988. As per office note, the order of dismissal of writ petition, as against the contesting respondents no. 1 to 7, was communicated to the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, yet appropriate steps have not been taken for restoration of writ petition as against the aforesaid respondent no. 1 to 7.

The present writ petition arises out of a proceeding under the provisions of The Bihar Consolidation of Holdings and Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1956. In view of dismissal of the present writ petition as against the contesting respondent no. 1 to 7, the matter cannot proceed further, as the writ petition itself has become incompetent.

In above view of the matter, the writ petition as a whole stands dismissed, since it has become incompetent.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

BTiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--