

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15796 of 2011

- =====
1. Jeewan Kumar Rai S/O Late Surya Narayan Rai, Resident of Village-Bhaptiahi, P.S.-Laukahi, Anchal Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani (Bihar).
 2. Mahipati Rai S/O Late Ganrup Ra, Resident of Village-Bhaptiahi, P.S.-Laukahi, Anchal Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani (Bihar).
 3. Rotish Kumar Rai S/O Late Shakti Kumar Rai, Resident of Village-Bhaptiahi, P.S.-Laukahi, Anchal Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani (Bihar).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Land Acquisition Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector of the District-Madhubani.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Madhubani, District-Madhubani.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Phulparas, District-Madhubani.
5. The Circle Officer, Block-Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani.
6. Most. Ram Sundari Devi W/O Late Taufi Lal Rai, Resident of Village-Bhaptiahi, P.S.-Laukahi, Anchal-Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani (Bihar).
7. Ashutosh Kumar Rai S/O Late Taufi Lal Rai, Resident of Village-Bhaptiahi, P.S.-Laukahi, Anchal- Ghoghardiha, District-Madhubani (Bihar).

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None.

For the Respondent Nos.1 to 5 : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma, PAAG-I

For the Respondent Nos. 6 & 7 : Mr. Bishwanath Prasad Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

7 27-07-2016 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-1 appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 1 to 5, on the other hand, submits that in view of the earlier order dated 06.09.2010 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 14733 of 2010 (Annexure-7) filed on behalf of the petitioners

themselves, they ought to have raised their grievances before the learned civil court where reference regarding land acquisition case in question is already pending; therefore, according to him, the present writ petition is not maintainable.

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			
---	--	--	--