

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1667 of 2016

- =====
1. Katareah Joint Farming Cooperative Society Ltd. Katareah, Police Station- Kursella, District- Katihar through its Secretary.
 2. Babloo Kumar Singh, Son of late Girdhari Singh, resident of Village Katareah, Police Station- Kursella, District- Katihar, presently Secretary of Katareah Joint Farming Co-operative Society Limited, Katareah.
 3. Satrugan Sahni, son of late Shyam Lal Sahni, resident of Village Katareah, Police Station- Kursella, District- Katihar, presently President of Katareah Joint Farming Co-operative Society Limited, Katareah.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Sri Vivek Kumar Singh, son of not known to the petitioner, the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Union of India through Sri Rajiv Aggrawal, son of not known to the petitioner the General Manager, Eastern Central Railway at Hajipur, District- Vaishali.
3. Sri Lalanji Son of presently not known to the petitioners, Collector, Katihar, Bihar.
4. Sri Om Prakash Gupta, Son of Presently not known to the petitioners, Circle Officer, Barari, Katihar, Bihar.
5. Sri Sanjay Singh, Son of presently not known to the petitioners, Senior Divisional Engineer-II, Eastern Central Railway at Sonepur, District- Saran, Bihar.
6. Sri Ravindra Raj, Son of presently not known to the petitioners, Assistant Engineer, Eastern Central Railway, District- Bihpur, Bhagalpur.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar
For the State	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, GP-26
For the Railways	:	Mr.D.K. Sinha, Sr.Adv.
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD

ORAL ORDER

5 14-08-2018 In view of the statements made in the show cause filed on behalf of the opposite party nos.2, 5 and 6 clearly stating that the Railways is not willing to provide further lease of its land in favour of the petitioner no.1 and this has already been



communicated to him, this contempt application is not fit to proceed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, submits that a copy of the letter by which the petitioner no.1 is said to have been communicated about the decision of the Railways has not been made available to the petitioner no.1 and mode of dispatch of the said letter is also not mentioned in the show cause filed on behalf of the contesting opposite parties.

Learned senior counsel representing the Railways submits that he would personally ensure handing over a copy of the letter to the learned counsel representing the petitioners within a week's time.

In the aforesaid view of the matter, the application is disposed off as having become infructuous.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

