

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.250 of 2021

1. Ashok Kumar, Son of Late Adya Prasad Resident of Village-Khedalpura, P.O. and P.S.-Bihta, District-Patna, State-Bihar.
2. Shiv Chandra Kumar, Son of Late Adya Prasad, Resident of Village-Khedalpura, P.O. and P.S.-Bihta, District-Patna, State-Bihar.
3. Bijendra Kumar Son of Late Adya Prasad, Resident of Village-Khedalpura, P.O. and P.S.-Bihta, District-Patna, State-Bihar.
4. Satendra Kumar, Son of Late Adya Prasad, Resident of Village-Khedalpura, P.O. and P.S.-Bihta, District-Patna, State-Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Patna.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna.
4. Kundala Devi, Wife of Late Rameshwar Prasad, Resident of Mohalla-Chakaram, Post Office-G.P.O., Police Station-Budha Colony, District-Patna, Bihar.
5. Vijay Kumar, Son of Late Rameshwar Prasad, Resident of Mohalla-Chakaram, Post Office-G.P.O., Police Station-Budha Colony, District-Patna, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Lalit Kishore(AG) Mr.Md. Raisul Haque, SC 10 Mr.Rakesh Narayan Singh Mr. Shailendra Gandhi Mr. Sanjay Gandhi Mr.Prabhat Ranjan Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

4 07-04-2022 Despite repeated calls, none appeared on behalf of the petitioners. On previous date i.e. on 21.02.2022 as well, none appeared on behalf of the petitioners, despite repeated calls.



However, learned counsel for the State is in appearance.

Learned counsel for respondent nos. 4 and 5 has submitted respondent nos. 4 and 5 were co-sharers of the land, which was acquired in the land acquisition proceeding, but the cheque of the entire amount was prepared in the name of the petitioners. Land Acquisition Case No. 64 of 2021 was filed by the petitioners in which respondent nos. 4 and 5 were declared entitled of half of the amount awarded. As per the submission, F.A.No. 73 of 2018 is still pending against that order, although there is no stay in that appeal. In compliance of the order dated 27.04.2018, only the amount was paid to respondent nos. 4 and 5 by the impugned order.

I do not see any reason for interference in the impugned order. The civil miscellaneous petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--

