

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.491 of 1995

=====

Sk.Irfan, son of Late Sk. Manir, resident of village Ramnagar Tola Kumhiya, Police Station Palasi, District Araria

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Director of Consolidation, Bihar, Patna
3. The Joint Director of Consolidation, Bihar, Patna
4. The Deputy Director of Consolidation, Kishanganj
5. The Consolidation Officer, Joki-Hat, District Araria
6. Md. Taiyab, son of Sk. Hafiz, resident of village Rani, P.S. Joki-Hat, District Araria
7. Loknath Bhagat, son of Raghunandan Bhagat, resident of village Sisona, Police Station Joki-Hat, District Araria

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Bhanu Roy, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Najmul Hoda, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Din Bandhu Singh, G.P.-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.N. SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-07-2015

Counsel for the petitioner and the private respondents are present, but are unable to make submission in the matter as both petitioner and private respondents have taken the file from them.

2. This writ petition arises out of the different orders passed by the Consolidation Authorities i.e. Consolidation Officer, Jokihat, District Araria, Deputy Director, Consolidation, Kishanganj and Joint Director, Consolidation (Headquarters), Bihar, Patna contained in Annexures 1, 2 and 3, which are subject to the findings recorded by the competent Civil Court.

3. This writ petition was filed on 18.01.1995, notice to

Respondent nos. 6 and 7 was issued under order dated 10.03.1995 whereafter matter was admitted for hearing under order dated 14.12.1998. From order no. 6 dated 17.04.2013, it appears that time was granted to take steps for fresh service of notice on Respondent nos. 6 and 7. Again under order no. 7 dated 09.07.2014, four weeks time was granted to take steps for fresh service of notice on Respondent nos. 6 and 7, but the same could not be taken and the writ petition has been dismissed as against private Respondent nos. 6 and 7.

4. In the circumstances, the writ petition has become incompetent and is dismissed as having become incompetent.

(V.N. Sinha, J.)

Arjun/-

U			
---	--	--	--