

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.525 of 2005

=====

Gyan Chandra Bhagat son of Late Mathura Bhagat, resident of village Gobindpur, Police Station Falka, District Katihar

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
 2. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms at Katihar within the district of Katihar
 3. Bibi Nasima Khatoon wife of Md.Jaffo, resident of village Sekhpura, Police Station Bhawanipur, District Purnia
 4. Shaligram Sharma son of Late Bhagwan Sharma, resident of village Gobindpur, Police Station Falka, District Katihar
 5. Md.Sayeed son of Md.Habib
 6. Md.Garbhu @ Garmu son of Md.Habib
 7. Md.Fazlu Rahman son of Md.Kamaruddin
 8. Md.Isrish son of Md.Sabbir
- Respondent nos. 5 to 8 are residents of Navi Nagar, Naya Tola, Police Station Falka, District Katihar
9. Md.Gaffar son of Md.Mazid Alam, resident of village Mohanpur, Police Station Rupouli, District Purnia and at present at Village Navi Nagar, Police Station Falka, District Katihar

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. Vikas Ratan Bharti, AC to GP 9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 08-11-2016 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the petitioner in support of the present writ petition. However, I have heard the learned AC to GP 9 appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 and 2.

The learned State counsel, after going through the record of this case, has rightly pointed out that the present writ petition stood rejected as against the contesting respondent nos. 3 to 9 on account of non-compliance of the Court's peremptory order dated 20.02.2006, as a result of which, the present matter has become incompetent and cannot proceed further.

The submission made by the learned State counsel

stands corroborated by the office note dated 26.09.2016.

In view of the fact that the writ petition has stood rejected way back in the year 2006 against the contesting respondent nos. 3 to 9 on account of non-compliance of the Court's peremptory order dated 20.02.2006, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose shall be served by keeping the present matter pending as the writ petition has to fail in absence of the contesting respondent nos. 3 to 9.

In above view of the matter, the present writ petition is dismissed since it has become incompetent.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--