

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.548 of 2017

1. Sunil Chaubey and Ors son of Late Naresh Chaubey, resident of Mohalla- Chandmari, P.S.- Motihari Town, District- East Champaran.
2. Shambhu Raut, son of Late Saryug Raut, resident of Mohalla- Banjariya Pandal, P.S.- Banjariya, District- East Champaran.
3. Md. Bhola, son of Jahir Mian, resident of Mohalla- Belbanwa, Station Road, Motihari, P.S.- Motihari Town, District- East Champaran.
4. Ramchandra Prasad, son of Late Basu Sah, resident of Mohalla- Belbanwa, P.S.- Motihari Town, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Urban Development and Housing Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Collector cum District Magistrate, Motihari East Champaran.
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner cum Chief Executive Officer, District Board Motihari, East Cham
6. The Motihari District Board, East Champaran through its Chief Executive Officer, Motihari, East Cha
7. The Chief Executive Officer, District Board Motihari, East Champaran.
8. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sadar Motihari, East Champaran.
9. The District Engineer, District Board, Motihari, East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajiv Roy-Gp1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Zila Parishad.

The learned counsel for the petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated 25.11.2016 contained in Memo No. 239 issued by the District Engineer, District Board, East Champaran



(Annexure-4 series) whereby the District Engineer has directed the petitioners to vacate the shop till 31.12.2016 which was allotted to them by the then Chief Executive Officer, District Board, Motihari, East Champaran.

On query of the Court from the learned counsel for the petitioners as to where is the agreement in pursuance whereof he had entered the shop, the learned counsel submits that neither the petitioners supplied him with the copy of agreement nor he has a copy of agreement, in absence of agreement, it is difficult for this Court to adjudicate the issue.

Accordingly, the present writ application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

