

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15932 of 2014

=====

Pintu Kumar Singh S/o Satyendra Singh R/o village - Kusahi, P.S. Nokha,
District - Rohtas

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Collector, Rohtas
2. The D.C.L.R. Sasaram, Rohtas
3. The Circle Officer, Nokha, District - Rohtas
4. The SHO, Nokha P.S. District - Rohtas
5. Ram Pravesh Rai S/o Late Ramji Rai R/o village - Naran, P.S. Nokha,
District - Rohtas

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None.

For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 : Mr. AC to SC-25

=====


CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-11-2016 Despite repeated calls, none appears on behalf of the petitioner in support of the present writ petition, though the name of the learned counsel appearing on his behalf is printed in the daily cause list.

The learned AC to SC-25 appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 1 to 4, on the other hand, submits that the impugned order passed by the respondent D.C.L.R. is appealable before the prescribed appellate authority under the provisions of The Bihar Land Disputes Resolution Act, 2009, but the petitioner, without exhausting the alternative remedy of appeal before the prescribed appellate authority as also without approaching the learned Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna, has straightaway filed the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, according to him, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed on that ground alone.

Be that as it may, since none is appearing on behalf of

the petitioner, the present writ petition stands dismissed for want of prosecution.



(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)