

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 8483 of 1995

- =====
- 1 Ramapatti Singh, son of late Ambika Singh
 - 2 Uma Patti Singh, son of late Ambika Singh
 - 3 Mosmat Sonajharo Devi, wife of Jagat Patti Singh
 - 4 Sati Ram Singh, son of Jagat Patti Singh, residents of Village – Nuaon, PS –
Bikramganj, District - Rohtas

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1 State of Bihar
- 2 The Joint Director, Consolidation (Shri N K P Sharma) (Headquarters), Bihar,
Patna
- 3 The Deputy, Director, Consolidation, Rohtas (Sasaram)
- 4 The Consolidation Officer, Bikramganj, District – Rohtas
- 5 Jag Narayan Singh
- 6 Wakil Singh, son of late Rajeshwar Singh
- 7 Bisheshwar Singh
- 8 Singheshwar Singh
- 9 Tapeswar Singh
- 10 Bishwanath Singh, sons of late Amar Dayal Singh
- 11 Raj Ballabh Singh
- 12 Bali Ram Singh
- 13 Dhanik Singh, sons of Deo Lal Singh, residents of Village & PO – Nueon,
Police Station – Bikramganj, District - Rohtas

.... Respondent/s

WITH

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8484 of 1995

- =====
- 1 Mosmat Sona Jharo Devi, wife of Jagat Patti Singh
 - 2 Ramapatti Singh, son of late Ambika Singh
 - 3 Uma Patti Singh, son of late Ambika Singh
 - 4 Sati Ram Singh, son of Jagat Patti Singh, residents of Village – Nuaon, PS –
Bikramganj, District - Rohtas

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1 State of Bihar
- 2 The Joint Director, Consolidation (Shri N K P Sharma) (Headquarters), Bihar,
Patna
- 3 The Deputy, Director, Consolidation, Rohtas (Sasaram)
- 4 The Consolidation Officer, Bikramganj, District – Rohtas
- 5 Jag Narayan Singh
- 6 Wakil Singh, son of late Rajeshwar Singh
- 7 Bisheshwar Singh
- 8 Singheshwar Singh
- 9 Tapeswar Singh
- 10 Bishwanath Singh, sons of late Amar Dayal Singh
- 11 Raj Ballabh Singh
- 12 Bali Ram Singh
- 13 Dhanik Singh, sons of Deo Lal Singh, residents of Village & PO – Nueon,

Police Station – Bikramganj, District - Rohtas

.... Respondent/s

For the Petitioner/s : N O N E

For the S t a t e : Mr Indrajeet Bhushan, AC to GP II

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE NAVANITI PRASAD SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-07-2015

Both these writ petitions are by the same group of petitioners as against the same group of private respondents. No one is present on behalf of the petitioners nor on behalf of private respondents. State counsel is present and has been heard.

2 Learned counsel for the State draws attention of the Court to the fact that while the case was admitted, notices were directed to be issued to the private contesting respondents. Notices, not having been filed, the writ petition stood dismissed as against the private contesting respondents as far back as in 1995 itself. The information was duly given to the learned counsel for the petitioners who has not taken any step in the matter and, as such, the writ petition against the private respondents stood dismissed. He submits that in absence of the contesting parties, in whose favour the impugned orders have been passed, the writ petition itself becomes not maintainable.

3 Having considered the matter, the objection of the

learned counsel for the State is correct. The orders under challenge are orders passed in favour of the private respondents. The writ petition stood dismissed as against them.

4 Thus, the writ petition itself now becomes not maintainable and is dismissed accordingly.

(Navaniti Prasad Singh, J)

M.E.H./-

U			
---	--	--	--