

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.77 of 2017

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6746 of 2016

-
1. Jibachh Urawn
 2. Jago Urawn
 3. Chunni Urawn @ Sunil Urawn All Sons of Late Tipu Urawn Son of Late Bhawal Urawn.
 4. Rama Nand Urawn
 5. Yogendra Urawn
 6. Sachit Urawn
 7. Saroj Urawn @ Naroj Urawn All 4 to 7 Sons of Late dev Lal Urawn All Resident of Village-Haridyanagar Ward no. 1, P.S. Banmankhi, District-Purnia

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Purnea Division, Purnea.
3. The District Magistrate, Purnea
4. Addl. Collector, Purnea
5. The D.C.L.R. Banmankhi, District-Purnia
6. The Circle Officer, Banmankhi, District-Purnea
7. Chandra Shekhar Singh Son of Late Kameshwar Singh Resident of Village-Dharahara, P.S. Banmankhi District Purnea

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellants : Mr. Anant Kumar-1, Advocate
Ms. Kiran Kumari, Advocte.
For the Respondents : Mr. Md.Khurshid Alam-Aag12

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 25-09-2018

Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with the impugned order passed on 29.11.2016 in C.W.J.C. No. 6746 of 2016 by which the learned single Judge dismissed the petition, the original writ petitioner has preferred this Letters Patent Appeal.



Having heard the counsel for the respective parties and considering the orders passed by the statutory authorities which came to be confirmed by the learned Single Judge, we see no reason to interfere with the order impugned. The claim of the original writ petitioners with respect to lands in question has been rejected by three statutory authorities, including the Land Tribunal which has been confirmed by the learned Single Judge. Learned counsel for the appellants is not in a position to point out any infirmity in the order passed by the learned Single Judge as well as the orders passed by the statutory authorities by which the claim made by the petitioners has been rejected. We are of the view that no interference is called for by this Court in intra court appellate jurisdiction.

Under such circumstances, the present appeal is dismissed.

(Mukesh R. Shah, CJ)

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.09.2018
Transmission Date	26.09.2018

