

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9888 of 2015

=====

Suresh Das, S/o Late Parmeshwar Das, R/o Pupri Nagar, Panchayat
Janakpur Road, Pupri, Ward No. 7, P.S. - Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
 2. The Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
 3. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
 4. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
 5. The Sub Divisional Magistrate, Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.
 6. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.
 7. The Circle Officer, Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.
 8. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
 9. The Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi.
 11. The Station House Officer, Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.
 12. Ram Dayal Sah, Son of Late Baldeo Sah,
 13. Pravin Kumar,
 14. Navin Kumar Sah, Both Sons of Ram Dayal Sah,
- The Respondents No. 12, 13 and 14 are residents of Village - Pupri, P.O. -
Ratna Lakshi Pupri, P.S. - Pupri, District - Sitamarhi.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Das, Adv.

For the Respondent nos.1to11 : Mr. Amaresh Kumar Sinha, AC to GA-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-12-2015 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned AC to GA-9 appearing on behalf of the respondent nos.1
to 11.

The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ
petition is that despite the order and direction dated 20.11.2014
passed in Land Dispute Resolution Case No.62 of 2014-15 by the
respondent DCLR, Pupri, Sitamarhi, as contained in Annexure-1,
the respondent Circle Officer, Pupri is not implementing the
aforesaid order and on one pretext or the other the suitable follow-
up action is not being taken by the aforesaid authority.

The learned AC to GA-9 appearing on behalf of the



official respondents, on the other hand, submits that for redressal of his valid grievances, the petitioner should approach the respondent DCLR, Pupri himself and only on denial of the relief he may approach the higher forum or this Court. He further submits that, for execution of the aforesaid order, the petitioner has, in fact, approached the respondent DCLR, Pupri, but he has not taken any follow-up action in view of the pendency of the present writ petition. In support of above contention, he has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 24.09.2015 passed by the respondent DCLR, Pupri, as contained in Annexure-5 to the supplementary affidavit. He further submits that, if the petitioner withdraws the present writ petition and approaches the respondent DCLR, Pupri his valid grievances shall be looked into and shall be redressed appropriately in accordance with law.

After having heard the parties and in view of the order dated 24.09.2015 passed by the respondent DCLR, Pupri (Annexure-5) and in view of the submissions made by the learned State counsel, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose shall be served by keeping the present matter pending any longer, rather interest of justice shall be sub-served, if the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent DCLR, Pupri for redressal of his valid grievances. It is ordered accordingly.

If the petitioner appears before the respondent DCLR, Pupri within a period of three weeks from today with a certified copy of the present order as also with an appropriate petition, then the respondent DCLR, Pupri shall look into the valid grievances of the petitioner and shall take appropriate follow up action for redressal of his valid grievances. However, before passing any final order, an opportunity of hearing must be given to

all concerned including the private respondent nos. 12 to 14.

The writ petition stands finally disposed of with the observations and directions made above.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--