

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5047 of 2015

- =====
1. Ramautar Khetan and Ors Sons of Late Matya Narain Khetan.
 2. Archana Khetan, Wife of Late Pawan Khetan.
 3. Vishal Khetan, Son of Late Pawan Khetan. All residents of Barahat, P.S. Barahat, District- Banka. At present residing in Mohalla- Baijnathpur, P.S. and District- Deoghar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Collector, Banka
3. The Additional Collector, Banka.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Banka.
5. The Ahchala Adhikari, Barahat, Banka.
6. The Block Development Officer, Barhat, District- Banka.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Pathak,SC-7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

5 18-02-2019 An order dated 05.11.2014, passed by the learned

Chairman, Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 661

of 2013 has been put to challenge in the present writ application.

2. The order is short and is being reproduced herein

below:-

*“No one appears for the
petitioners. This application is otherwise also
not maintainable for the reason that the
petitioner had earlier taken time on the
ground that he will file application for
restoration of consolidation revision and get
it finally adjudicated so that the order passed*



in the revision application can be brought before this Tribunal for proper adjudication.

It seems that the petitioners' counsel has not made any effort for restoration of consolidation revision. In this view of the matter I find no merit in this application and as such it is dismissed."

3. Evidently, the petitioners' case has been rejected in the background of the fact that their consolidation revision application was dismissed for default and the petitioners did not make any serious effort to get the said revision application restored.

4. Statement has been made in the present writ application in paragraph 32 that the said application for restoration filed by the petitioners on 23.07.2014 is still pending.

5. I do not intend to interfere with the impugned order of the Tribunal dated 05.11.2014, considering the background in which the said order has been passed.

6. In the facts and circumstances of the case, I dispose of this application with a direction to the Director, Consolidation to dispose of the petitioners' application for restoration, which is said to have been filed on on 23.07.2014



for restoration of Consolidation Revision Case No. 441 of 1997, if not already disposed of, within two months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

7. This disposes of the application.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

arun/-

U			
---	--	--	--

