

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8904 of 2007

- =====
1. Devendra Ram son of Sri Katari Ram
 2. Rahamtulah Mian, son of Late Wakil Mian
 3. Tajmulah Mian, son of Late Gafur Mia
 4. Manilal Kurmi son of Late Nathuni Kurmi
 5. Sri Ram Mahto, son of Late Bhadai Mahto
 6. Shyamlal Prasad son of Hiralal Sah
 7. Ramnagina Prasad, son of Dharamnath Prasad
 8. Baburam Prasad, son of Ram Tijan Prasad
 9. Dawarika Prasad, son of Janki Prasad, all resident of village & P.O. Amlori, P.S. Siwan, Muffasil, District Siwan.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary Land Reform Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary Land Reform Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Chapra.
4. The District Collector, Siwan.
5. The Additional District Collector, Siwan.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Siwan.
7. The Circle Officer, Siwan Sadar, District Siwan.
8. Durga Devi wife of Shri Bindu Bhushan Singh, village Amlori, P.S. Siwan Mufasil, District Siwan.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None.

For the Respondent No.1 to 7 : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma, AC to PAAG-I

For the Respondent No. 8 : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 12-08-2016 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 AC to PAAG-I appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 1 to 7 and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.8, on the other hand, submits that the impugned order passed by the respondent District Collector, Siwan, setting aside the order passed by the Additional Collector,

Siwan, re-opening the original land ceiling case under Section 45B of The Bihar Land Reforms (Fixation of Ceiling Area and Acquisition of Surplus Land) Act, 1961 cannot be legally faulted and the writ petition is liable 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)

BTiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--