

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23716 of 2013

=====

1. Jagannath Jha Son Of Late Raj Narain Jha Resident of Village Bhavanipur, P.S.- Sakari, Dist.- Madhubani

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Home (Police Department), Government Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Home (Police Department), Government Of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Madhubani
4. The Superintendent of Police, Madhubani
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sadar, Madhubani
6. The Competent Authority Cum Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Madhubani
7. The Circle Officer, Pandaul, Dist.- Madhubani
8. Rajo Saday Son of Late Gultane Saday Resident of Village Bhavanipur P.S. Sakri, Dist.- Madhubani
9. Mahendra Saday Son of Late Lakhan Saday Resident Of Village Bhavanipur P.S. Sakri, Dist.- Madhubani
10. Gonaaur Saday Son of Late Gultane Saday Resident Of Village Bhavanipur P.S. Sakri, Dist.- Madhubani
11. Chauthi Saday Son Of Late Janak Saday Resident Of Village Bhavanipur P.S. Sakri, Dist.- Madhubani
12. Pitambar Thakur Son Of Late Kapileshwar Thakur Resident Of Village Bhavanipur P.S. Sakri, Dist.- Madhubani

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vaidehi Raman Prasad Singh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Awdhesh Kumar Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 15-07-2016 Heard Mr. Vaidehi Raman Prasad Singh for the
petitioner and Mr. Awdhesh Kumar Pandey for the State.

A copy of the counter affidavit is produced by Mr.
Pandey for perusal of the Court. Service thereof on the counsel
for the petitioner has not been disputed.



The grievance of the petitioner is that although an order has been passed on 16.06.2012 in favour of the petitioner and his ancestors by the respondent-Deputy Collector, Land Reforms (for short "The DCLR") in Land Dispute Resolution Case No. 170/2011-12, the same has not been implemented by the official respondent(s), inasmuch as, the private respondent(s) continued to disturb the possession of the petitioner over the subject land. In the counter affidavit, it has been stated that appropriate steps have been taken towards the execution/implementation of the order passed by the respondent-DCLR, inasmuch as the Sub-Divisional Officer issued a notice to the concerned.

Section 15 of the Land Dispute Resolution Act read with Rule 30 of the Rules 2010 framed thereunder enables the DCLR to take steps for execution of the order passed by him. If the petitioner is not satisfied with the action taken by the official(s) in the light of the order passed by the DCLR, he may approach the respondent-DCLR for complete execution of the order.

The writ application stands disposed of.

Needless to observe, if any such application/representation is filed. The respondent-DCLR shall

consider the same and take appropriate steps as required under the provisions of the Act and the Rules framed thereunder without further delay of time.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--