

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8627 of 2015

=====

Pankaj Kumar S/o Lallan Prasad @ Lalji Resident of Gosaibagh, Near
Anugrah Vidyalaya, Town and District Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
3. Deputy Development Land Commissioner, Sadar, Gaya.
4. Officer Incharge, Kotwali Police Station, Gaya.
5. Usha Devi W/o Ashok Keshri Resident of Mohalla Nagwanshi Sahay Lane,
Police Station Kotwali, District Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjeev Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Mujtabaul Haque, G.P.-12
		Mr. Manish Kumar, AC to GP-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

3 14-08-2024 The present writ petition has been filed
seeking the following relief:-

“1. That this writ petition has been preferred on behalf of the petitioner abovenamed for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction to quash the order dated 17.10.2013 passed in Bihar Land Dispute Resolution Case No.168/2013-14 by Deputy Land Development Officer, Sadar (Gaya), Gaya whereby he has held that the land belongs to the applicant and not her husband and the business transaction was entered in between the husband of



the applicant and the petitioner herein and therefore, direction was issued to dispossess the petitioner from his settled possession by terming same as encroachment. The petitioner also assails the consequential action dated 25.11.2013 of the Officer Incharge of Kotwali Police Station, whereby he has forcibly ousted the petitioner from the said shop premises by throwing out all the articles on the street and subsequently thereafter for which an inventories were prepared. The petitioner further prayed for a writ of Mandamus directing status quo ante as on 23.11.2013 be restored as the action of the Deputy Collector Land Reforms was wholly without jurisdiction and a nullity as person in settled possession by virtue of an agreement could not be ousted by holding him to be encroacher by taking recourse to the order passed under the Act."

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous during the interregnum period, hence the same be disposed off.
3. Accordingly, the present writ petition



stands disposed off.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--

