

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1354 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4687 of 2015

=====

Ajay Kumar Singh, son of Late Sitaram Singh, resident of Village
and P.O. Malkhachak, P.S.- Dighwara, District- Saran (Chapra).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Collector, Saran at Chapra.
3. The Deputy Collector, Land Reform, Sonapur, District- Saran.
4. The Anchal Adhikari, Dighwara Anchal, District- Saran.
5. The Halka Karamchari, Mahal Basantpur, Gram Panchayat Baruan,
Village- Malkhachak, P.S.- Dighwara, Block- Dighwara, District-
Saran (Chapra).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s: Mr. Md. Khurshid Alam - AAG12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

3 19-04-2018 It appears that the petitioner had earlier filed a writ
petition being C.W.J.C. No 4687 of 2015 which was disposed of
on 23.06.2015 granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the
Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra by filing a
representation along with copy of documents as well as a copy
of this order. M.J.C. No. 593 of 2016 for modification of that
order was filed by the petitioner stating that description of the
land was wrong in paragraph nos. 1 and 4 of the writ petition.
Accordingly, the description of land was allowed to be amended



by recording new Khata No. 517/60-61-62 belonging to Tauzi No. 2938, Thana No. 140, Sonapur Pragana Kasmar, District Saran” and the said application was disposed of on 02.03.2016. Yet again, the petitioner filed for modification of that order and about 62 plots have been included for amendment in the order passed in the writ petition.

This court is surprised as to how such steps can be taken by the petitioner time and again.

Learned counsel for the State has submitted that every time the petitioner files an application for correction of the Khata No. and Plot No. etc. and this time he has included about 62 plots.

In my opinion, this is an abuse of process of law. However, the petitioner is personally present and submits that he did not have knowledge of earlier order which has been passed and further since learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he wants to withdraw this application, this application stands dismissed as withdrawn, however, with a caution to the petitioner to be careful in future. This is also intriguing as to how a copy of the petition would be served upon the Office of the Advocate General after changing two pages, i.e., Page Nos. 3 and 4.



Be that as it may, since an apology has been tendered
by the learned counsel, the petitioner and the Advocate Clerk,
this Court would not proceed further on this issue.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Vikash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

