

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6426 of 2013

=====

Gupteshwar Sao, Son Of Late Jamuna Sao, Resident Of Village, P.O. And
P.S. Salaiya, Madanpur, District - Aurangabad

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad
3. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Aurangabad
4. The Special Land Acquisition Officer, Sone Project, Aurangabad
5. The Circle Officer, Madanpur, Aurangabad
6. The Circle Inspector, Manadpur Anchal, Aurangabad
7. Mr. Lala Sao Son Late Mathura Sao Resident Of Village, P.O. And P.S.
Salaiya Madanpur, District - Aurangabad
8. Mr. Kedar Sao Son Bhuwaneshwar Sao Resident Of Village, P.O. And
P.S. Salaiya Madanpur, District - Aurangabad

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent nos.1to6: Mr.Ajay Kumar Sharma, AC to PAAG
For the Respondent no.7 : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 09-03-2016 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the petitioner in support of the present writ petition, though the names of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner are printed in the daily cause list.

The learned AC to PAAG appearing on behalf of the respondent nos.1 to 6 and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.7, on the other hand, by referring to the averments made in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent no.4, submit that, for the identical relief, Title (Partition) Suit No.273 of 2011 is pending before the learned Sub-ordinate Judge, Aurangabad between the parties. Therefore, according to them, the present writ petition is not maintainable and is fit to be dismissed on that ground alone.

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

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--