

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4850 of 2003

=====

Urmila Devi wife of Late Sarjug Dass, resident of Village Khankitta,
P.S.Sabour, District Bhagalpur

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
 2. The District Magistrate-cum-District Collector, Bhagalpur, District Bhagalpur
 3. The Anchal Adhikari, Sabour Anchal, District Bhagalpur
 4. The Circle Inspector, Sabour Anchal, District Bhagalpur
 5. Shiv Balak Razak, father's name not known, Circle Inspector, Sabour Anchal, District Bhagalpur
 6. The Halka Karamchari, Sabour Anchal, District Bhagalpur
 7. Ambika Paswan, father's name not known, the Halka Karamchari, Sabour Anchal, District Bhagalpur
 8. Bechu Dass son of late Misser Harijan
 9. Lukhar Harijan son of Late Khedu Harijan
 10. Mango Dass son of Late Khedu Harijan
- Respondent Nos. 8 to 10 are resident of Village Khankitta, P.S. Sabour, District Bhagalpur
11. Tarni Thakur son of Late Bulaki Thakur (Expunged vide order dated 04.08.2009 and substituted by his following heirs and legal representatives)
 - 11 (i) Kalwa Devi (wife)
 - 11(ii) Bablu Thakur(son)
 - 11(iii)Krishna Thakur (son)
 - 11(iv) Manoj Thakur (son-minor)
 - 11(v)Sundari Devi (daughter-married)
 - 11(vi) Kavita Devi (daughter-married)
- Residents of Village Hadhichak, P.S.Kahalgaon, District Bhagalpur,
at present Village Khankitta, P.S.Sabour, District Bhagalpur

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 7 : Mr. Aditya Nath Jha, AC to SC 18

For the Respondent Nos. 8 to 10 : Mr. Manoj Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 06-09-2016

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 her behalf are printed in the daily cause list.

The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

respondent nos. 8 to 10 by looking into the records of this Case submits that the present writ petition has stood dismissed as against substituted respondent nos. 11(i) to 11(vi) on account of non-compliance of the court's peremptory order dated 04.08.2009. He next submits that, in fact, the reliefs sought are against the aforesaid respondents as well, besides other respondents. Therefore, the present writ petition has become incompetent.

The submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the aforesaid private respondent nos. 8 to 10 appear to be correct in view of the office note dated 05.09.2016.

In above view of the matter, the present writ petition has to fail and is, accordingly, dismissed as having become incompetent.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--