

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18274 of 2013

- =====
1. Maya Barnwal W/O Sri Vinod Kumar Barnwal Resident of Mohalla- Purshattm Das Lane, Muradpur, Police Station- Kotwali, Post Office Head Office, Gaya, District- Gaya, at present Mohalla- Punjabicolony, Naigodawn, P.S- Kotwali, Distt- Gaya.
2. Sudama Devi W/O Sri Ram Briksh Saw Resident of Mohalla- Ramna Mazzar, Police Station- Civil Line, Post Office- Gpo, District- Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary.
2. The District Magistrate Cum Collector, District- Gaya.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police Gaya, District- Gaya.
4. Inspector Cum Officer In- Charge, Kotwali Thana, Towan And District- Gaya.
5. Divisional Forest Officer Cum Licencing Officer Gaya Division, Gaya.
6. Sri Alok Kumar (I.F.S), Divisional Forest Officer, Gaya Forest- Division, Sevanagar New Karimganj, District- Gaya.
7. Sri Anand Kisore Dwivedi S/O Sri Vidyanand Dwivedi Resident Of Mohalla- Dakhin Darwaga, Police Station- Civil Line, Post Office- District- Gaya.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kanhaiya Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sunil Kr. Mandal, S.C.3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 01-12-2017

None appears on behalf of the petitioners.

Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar Mandal S.C.3 who appears for the State and perused the records.

The petitioners are aggrieved by the renewal of the Licence No. 119 of 1997 which stands in the name of one Chandu Lal Patel and according to the petitioner it is being operated by an attorney holder i.e respondent no.7. Mr. Mandal learned State counsel has invited the attention of this Court to the letter of the Sub Divisional Officer at



Annexure-6/1 to submit that the complaint of the petitioner was taken note of and she has been assured of appropriate proceedings provided the complaint has substance. The letter also mentions that the licence is issued in the name of Chandu Lal Patel and it is on attorney that the private respondent is operating. By the said letter it was also informed that for the time being the operation of the saw mill has been stayed with assurance that if necessary, confiscation proceedings would be initiated.

In my opinion the letter at Annexure-6/1 itself should satisfy the petitioner and as there is nothing on record to show that the grievance of the petitioner subsists, I am not persuaded to keep the writ petition pending which is accordingly disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

Bibhash/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	09.12.2017
Transmission Date	NA

