

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.868 of 2014

=====

1. Ajeet Kumar Gupta S/O Late Gopinath Gupta Resident Of Village + P.O.
+ P.S. - Telhara, District - Nalanda

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Art, Culture And Youth Affairs Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary , Art, Culture And Youth Affairs Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Joint Secretary, Art, Culture And Youth Affairs Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
4. The Collector, Nalanda At Biharsharif
5. The Circle Officer, Ekangarsarai, District - Nalanda
6. The Block Development Officer, Ekangarsarai, District - Nalanda
7. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Hilsa, Nalanda

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Keshari

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 26-02-2015

None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Mr. Ujjawal Kumar Sinha, Assistant Counsel to

AAG XI appears for the State and with reference to paragraph 6 of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondent nos. 4 to 7 submits that the petitioner is the son of Gopi Nath Gupta, who had purchased the land in question, by virtue of a sale deed dated 16.08.1971, although subsequently Gopi Nath Gupta has exchanged plot no. 1706 which is the subject matter of dispute with Chak No. 551, having an area of 1.20 acres under Khata No. 113, Thana No. 15 of village Balabigha, Pargana Telhara, then



Thana Ekangarsarai, in the district of Patna on 13.12.1971. He submits that copy of the registered exchange deed is annexed as Annexure-A to the counter affidavit and a copy of which though was served upon the petitioner on 28.02.2014 but has not been controverted. He further submits that similar stand has also been taken in the counter affidavit filed by the Director, Archeology, Department of Art, Culture and Youth, Bihar, Patna. It is further submitted that if the petitioner, in any way, is aggrieved by the action taken by his father, his remedy would lie before the civil court of competent jurisdiction.

Although, prima facie, there is nothing in this writ application which would warrant indulgence to the prayer made by the petitioner but since there is none to appear to press this writ application, it is dismissed for non prosecution.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Amin/-

U			
---	--	--	--