

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.836 of 2016

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 7560 of 1995

=====

1. Rajiv Ranjan Singh Son of late Girish Ranjan Singh Resident of Village:
Jalapur ,PS Amnaur District Saran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Jagdish Bhagat Son of Kagzee Bhagat Resident of Village: Jalapur ,PS
Amnaur District Saran.
2. Smt. Baharan Devi Wife of Kamla Bhagat, daughter of Ganga Bhagat,
resident of Village: Kharika, PS: Sonepur District Saran.
3. The State of Bihar.
4. Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Marhaura Saran.
5. Additional Collector, Saran.
6. The Additional member, Board of Revenue ,Bihar Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

with

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.839 of 2016

IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 7559 of 1995

- =====
1. Shri Kameshwar Prasad Yadav
2. Shri Akhilesh Prasad yadav Both Sons of Shri Ambika Prasad Singh
resident of Village : Dharhara Khurd, PS Amnaur, District Saran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Jagdish Bhagat Son of Kagzee Bhagat Resident of Village: Jalalpur PS
Amnaur, District Saran.
2. Smt. Baharan Devi Wife of Kamla Bhagat, daughter of Ganga Bhagat,
Resident of Village : Kharika PS Sonepur District Saran.
3. The State of Bihar.
4. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Marhaura , Saran.
5. Additional Collector, Saran.
6. The Additional member, Board of Revenue ,Bihar Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

(In MJC No.836 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dineshwar Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ga10 Nivedita Nirvikar

(In MJC No.839 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dineshwar Mishra

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajiv Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 30-03-2016 Both the matters involve identical issues and, as such, they have been heard together with the consent of the parties.

Writ applications filed by the petitioner stood dismissed as not pressed under order dated 16.04.2015 which is extracted hereunder:-

“Mr. Ratnesh Kumar Singh learned counsel for the petitioner appears and states that this client has already taken the brief from him. He, therefore, showed his inability to argue the case.

This application arises out of preemption proceeding.

In view of the aforesaid, the application is dismissed as not pressed.”

Heard Mr. Dineshwar Mishra who represents the petitioners in both the applications as well as the Counsel who represented the respondents in the writ petition.

Prayer is made on behalf of the petitioner for modification of the order. On the specific prayer made by the Counsel for the petitioner, the writ applications were dismissed as not pressed.

I do not find any good ground to recall the said order. The applications are dismissed. However, considering the submissions of the petitioner, the Court observes that if the cause survives, the petitioners may file separate writ petitions and in doing so, they shall not be debarred or precluded in any manner by the order dated 16.04.2015 passed on the writ petition(s). Petitioners, if need

be, may also seek appropriate order for dispensing with filing of the certified copies of the impugned order(s).

Pankaj/-

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

U			
---	--	--	--