

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3703 of 2005

- =====
1. Sarwan Mahto son of Late Deep Narayan Mahto
 2. Upendra Mahto son of Late Sarbjeet Mahto
- Both are residents of Village Govind Chak, P.O. Govind Chak,
P.S.Sonepur, District Saran (Chapra)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Additional Member, Board of Revenue, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Additional Collector, Saran, Chapara
4. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector (L.R.D.C.), Sonepur, Saran (Chapra)
5. **Jamadar Singh son of Late Rashdhari Singh (Expunged vide order dated 06.04.2011 and substituted by his following heirs and legal representatives):**
 - 5 (A) Most. Phul Kumari (widow)
 - 5 (B) Ghanshyam Singh (son)
 - 5 (C) Pankaj Singh (son)
 - 5 (D) Deepak Singh (son)
 - 5 (E) Rinku Kumar (daughter)All are residents of Village Govind Chak, P.O. Govind Chak, P.S.Sonepur, District Saran (Chapra)
6. **Vijay Singh son of Late Jagdish Singh (Expunged vide order dated 19.05.2006 and substituted by his following heirs and legal representatives)**
 - 6 (A) **Mosmat Krishna Devi (Expunged vide order dated 06.04.2011 and her heirs are already on record as Respondent Nos. 6(B) to 6(D)).**
 - 6 (B) Ajay Singh
 - 6 (C) Raju Singh
 - 6 (D) Ranjan SinghAll are residents of Village Govind Chak, P.O. Govind Chak, P.S.Sonepur, District Saran (Chapra)

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 : Mr. Pratik Kr. Sinha, AC to GA 5
For the Respondent Nos. 5(A) to 5(D) : Mr. Chandra Shekhar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

9 11-08-2016 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the petitioners in support of the present writ petition, though the name of the learned counsel appearing on their behalf is printed in the daily cause list.

The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the private respondents submits that the petitioners have lost before all the three statutory authorities and the claim of pre-emption raised on behalf of original respondent no.5 has been allowed by all the three authorities by recording concurrent findings of facts against the petitioners; therefore, according to him, the writ petition is fit to be dismissed.

Be that as it may, since none is appearing on behalf of the petitioners, the writ petition stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--