

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5628 of 2016

Sulendra Yadav

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar and Ors

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Pandey Sanjay Sahay- SC-31
		Ms. Archana Meenakshee, GP-6

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 16-02-2024 Heard Mr. Akhileshwar Pandey, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and learned GP-6 representing the State.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in BLT case No. 1007 of 2013 dated 22.07.2015, by which the claim of the petitioners have been negated.

3. Having heard the parties, the BLT came to the conclusion which is incorporated in last paragraph and reads as follows:

“Perused materials available on the record, as per contention made by Mr. Panday the land was settled in favour of the applicants in the year 1934 itself, but on



repeated query made by this court. Mr. Panday could not apprise whether after settlement return was filed by ex-landlord in favour of the applicants, subsequently whether name of the applicants was entered in register II and in Revisional Survey record they started litigation from the materials on the record it is apparent that for fixation of rent only in the year 2010 after lapse of 76 years which appeared to be wholly unbelievable it is not expected that a person will go in deep slumber and will awake only after 66 years and will make application for fixation of rent. Petition filed by the applicants for the payment of amount under deposit is devoid of any merit and the same is rejected. Sub Divisional Officer Begusarai is directed to make payment of the amount under deposit to the parchaholders proportionately taking in to account. The area of land on which crop was grown by each of them, let this application be posted



*for final hearing on merit on 11.08.2015, let
copy of this the order be sent to D.M
Begusarai through fax message with
direction to get it sent to Sub Divisional
Officer Begusarai.”*

4. This Court is in agreement with the observation made by the BLT and no interference is required. The petitioner, if he so wants can pursue civil remedy before an appropriate Court.

5. The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

