

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7278 of 2016

=====

1. Anmol Yadav

2. Raj Kishore Yadav

Both are sons of Late Hari Lal Yadav and residents of Village- Kanhaili,
P.S.- Narpatganj, District- Araria

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principle Secretary, Revenue, Land
Reforms, Govt. of Bihar

2. The Sub Divisional Officer, Forbesganj, Araria

3. The Circle Officer, Narpatganj, Forbesganj

4. Rajo Yadav

5. Satto Yadav,

6. Ramanand Yadav,

Respondent nos. 4 to 6 are sons of Late Panchanand Yadav

7. Tarkeshwar Yadav,

8. Jay Kumar Yadav

9. Anand Yadav,

10. Shivanand Yadav,

Respondent nos. 7 to 10 are sons of Late Uday Chand Yadav and
residents of village- Kanhaili, P.S.- Narpatganj, District- Araria

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s

: Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Advocate

Mr. Ambrish Rahul, Advocate

For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 3: Mr. Jitendra Kumar, AC to AAG 14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-12-2016

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioners and the learned AC to AAG 14 appearing on behalf of
the respondent nos. 1 to 3.

The matter in issue is the claim raised on behalf of the
petitioners under Section 48D of the Bihar Tenancy Act (in short
“B.T.Act”) with respect to the lands, fully detailed in paragraph
3A of the writ petition.

The petitioners are aggrieved by the order dated
01.03.2016 passed in B.L.T. Case No. 733 of 2014 by the learned
Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna, as contained in Annexure-5 to the



writ petition, whereby the aforesaid case filed on behalf of the petitioners has been dismissed and the orders passed by the respondent Circle Officer, Narpatganj, as contained in Annexure-3 as also the appellate order passed by the respondent S.D.O. Forbisganj, as contained in annexure-4, rejecting the claim raised on behalf of the petitioners under Section 48D of the B.T.Act have been affirmed.

From the facts noticed above, it is apparent that by recording concurrent findings of fact, all the three authorities have rejected the claims of the petitioners under Section 48D of the B.T.Act with respect to the lands in question.

Though the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has argued the matter at some length, but he has not been able to point out any legal infirmity or procedural error in the orders impugned.

In above view of the matter, this Court does not feel persuaded to interfere with the orders impugned passed by the authorities concerned, which have been affirmed by the learned Tribunal. The writ petition is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--

