

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1046 of 2018

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11154 of 2017

=====

Dayal Sharan Son of Late Kamaleshwari Prasad, Resident of Village- Helajot,
P.O. and P.S.- Jhajha, District- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh, The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Old Secreta
3. Mr. Dr. Kaushal Kishore, The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Jamui, District- Jamui.
4. Mr. Sunil Kumar, The Additional District Magistrate Revenue, Jamui, District- Jamui.
5. Mr. Md. Atahar, The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Jamui, District- Jamui.
6. Mr. Nishant Kumar Patel, The Circle Officer, Jhajha, Circle- Jhajha, District- Jamui.
7. Mr. Akshaybat Tiwari, The Circle Officer, Chakai, Circle- Chakai, District- Jamui.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Asif Kalim, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 20-04-2023

Heard Mr. Nityanand Mishra, learned Advocate for
the petitioner and Mr. Asif Kalim for the State.

On the allegation of the petitioner that the respondent/authorities were collecting more rent than what was stipulated in the circular, a direction was given by a



Division Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 21.08.2017 in CWJC No. 11154 of 2017 to dispose of the representation of the petitioner, which would be filed before the District Magistrate.

The Principal Secretary of the Department was also directed to look into the representation of the petitioner and ensure that rent is collected in accordance with Government Circular.

Pursuant to the aforementioned order, the representation preferred by the petitioner before the District Magistrate was disposed of *vide* order dated 15.06.2018, which has been brought on record as one of the annexures to the show cause reply.

The rent collected from the petitioner was found to be in consonance with the stipulation in the concerned Circular.

However, the issue was left open by the District Magistrate giving liberty to the persons concerned to bring



it to his notice in case of any illegal rent collection from the landholders.

In this view of the matter, we are of the view that there has been a substantial compliance of the order passed by this Court.

In case, the petitioner is not satisfied with the order passed by the Collector he would have the liberty to challenge the same before an appropriate authority.

The contempt petition is thus disposed of accordingly.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Harish Kumar, J)

krishna/manoj

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	25.04.2023
Transmission Date	NA

