

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4244 of 2000

- =====
1. Ram Narayan Sah, son of late Asarfi Sah.
 2. Smt. Usha Devi, wife of Ram Narayan Sah.
- Both are residents of Village- Supaul, Town, P.S. and District- Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
 2. The Deputy Director, Consolidation, Purnea.
 3. Panchu Badhai.
 4. Badri Badhai.
 5. Rajendra Badhai.
- All are sons of late Chhatak Badhai.
6. Smt. Fushia Devi, wife of Sukhdeo Choudhary.
 7. Safiur Rahman.
 8. Matiur Rahman.
 9. Samiur Rahman.
- All are sons of Cheddi Rahman.
10. Kashi Yadav.
 11. Bhular Yadav.
- Both are sons of Buddi Yadav.
12. Bhola Chaudhary, son of Raghu Lal Choudhary.
 13. Bindeshwari Chaudhary
 14. Suresh Pd. Chaudhary.
- Both are sons of late Musaharu Choudhary.
- Respondent nos.3 to 14 are residents of Village & P.O.- Chainsingh Patti, P.S. and District- Supaul.
15. Durga Pd. Sharma.
 16. Ram Bihari Sharma.
- Both are sons of Panchu Sharma and are residents of Village & P.O.- Chainsingh Patti, P.S. and District- Supaul.
17. Most. Nathari, wife of late Nepali Sharma, resident of Village Ekma, P.S. and District- Supaul.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. (GP-5)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 22-07-2015 None appears on behalf of the petitioners.

This writ petition has stood dismissed as against the
private respondent nos.3 to 17 for non-compliance of the

peremptory order dated 17.7.2003.

Perusal of the records manifests that the two petitioners had preferred a revision application before the Director, Consolidation invoking the powers vested under section 35 of the Bihar Consolidation of Holdings and Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'). The revision application was filed directly for correction of the consolidation entries as against the private respondents and which has been dismissed by the impugned order passed on 28.7.1999.

Since the revision application so preferred by the petitioners was directed against the private respondents and the impugned order dismissing the revision application is drawn in favour of the private respondents, hence by dismissal of this writ petition for non-compliance of the peremptory order dated 17.7.2003 as against the private respondents the writ petition has been rendered incompetent and is dismissed as such.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--