

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2237 of 2017

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7639 of 1988

=====

Tahrun Nissa, Daughter of Late Kafiluddin, Wife of Saifuddin, Resident of
Village- Masidgarh, Police Station- Kochadhaman, Post Office- Alta Hat,
District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sri Pankaj Dixit, The District Magistrate, Kishanganj.
3. Sri Niraj Kumar Das, The Dy. Collector, Land Reforms, Kishanganj.
4. Sri Om Prakash Bhagat, The Circle Officer, Kochadhaman, District- Purnea.
5. Ram Lal Yadav, Son of Bacha Lal Yadav (Land Holder),
6. Prithvi Lal Yadav, Son of Bacha Lal Yadav (Land Holder),
7. Lakhan Lal Paswan, Son of Ghathi Paswan, Nos.5 and 6 and 7 residents of
Village- Masidgarh, Police Station- Kochadhaman, Post Office- Alta Hat,
District- Purnea.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhaneshwar Prasad Gupta, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Asif Kalim, Adv.
For the Respondent No. 7	:	Mr. Alok Kr. Choudhary, Adv.
	:	Ms. Priyanka Kumari, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 20-04-2023

We have heard Mr. Dhaneshwar Prasad

Gupta, the learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr.

Asif Kalim for the state.

2. By order dated 13.10.1988, a Division

Bench of this Court in C.W.J.C. No. 7639 of 1988



passed an interim order directing the respondents not to interfere with the possession of the petitioner over the land in question.

3. An order had been passed by the learned Additional Collector in Ceiling Case No. 28/86-87, from perusal of which it appeared that the petitioner was in possession of the land in question but even then the Red-Card was distributed to respondent No. 7.

4. The writ petition remained pending for adjudication, which was finally disposed off on 22.11.2022 holding that the parties had not been appearing in the matter giving an impression that they have lost interest in this case.

5. The writ petition thus was disposed off with a liberty to the parties to revive the case, in case the same was required.

6. With such disposal of the case, the interim order vanishes in thin air.

7. Thus, no contempt is maintainable against



an interim order passed in the year 1988 in a writ petition which was finally disposed off without any direction.

8. This petition is misconceived and is thus dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/Praveen

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	21.04.2023
Transmission Date	

