

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23204 of 2013**

- =====
1. Ahmad Hussain S/o Late Md. Hussain Resident of Alamganj, Kabutari Gali, P.S- Alamganj, District- Patna, Bihar
  2. Bacchu Ram S/o Late Jagdish Ram Resident of Puranderpur, P.S- Jakkanpur, District- Patna.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Urban Development Department, Government of Bihar, Secretariat, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Municipal Commissioner, Patna Municipal Corporation, 2nd Floor, Maurya Lok, Dak Bunglow Road, Patna.
4. The Estate Officer, Patna Municipal Corporation, 2nd Floor, Maurya Lok Dak Bunglow Road, Patna.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance:**

|                      |   |                                   |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Kumar Devashish, Advocate     |
|                      |   | Mr. Anirudh Kumar Singh, Advocate |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Amit Kumar Anand, AC to GP-15 |
| For the P.M.C.       | : | Mr. Prasoon Sinha, Advocate       |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      19-05-2016                      Heard the parties.

The petitioners seek to raise an issue of demolition of their shops which took place more than two decades back in 1995 relying upon the Division Bench judgment in L.P.A. No.135 of 1998 as affirmed by the Supreme Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the relief granted to the appellants before the Division Bench should also be extended to them.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and I have perused the records.

Apart from the fact that the writ petition is fit to be dismissed at the threshold on grounds of excessive delay even otherwise considering that the petitioners were not amongst those who had questioned the demolition in CWJC No.9747 of 1995 and the order passed in L.P.A. No.135 of 1998 as affirmed in S.L.P. No.6655 of 2008 by the Supreme Court extends only to the appellants therein, even the reliance on the judgments by learned counsel would bear no fruitful result.

In the circumstances discussed, the petitioners cannot be granted any indulgence either on merit or on delay for they have woken from deep slumber after more than two decades.

The writ petition stands disposed of.

**(Jyoti Saran, J)**

S.Sb/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|