

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14846 of 2024

=====

Udeshi Ray, Son of Shital Ray, Resident of Village- Lohargama Katesar, P.S Sakra District Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Collector, Muzaffarpur, District-Muzaffarpur.
3. Deputy Collector Land Reform (D.C.L.R.), Muzaffarpur.
4. Circle Officer, Sakra, District-Muzaffarpur.
5. Sri Vishwanath Thakur, Son of Late Tunmun Thakur, Resident of Village- Lohargama Katesar, P.S.-Sakra, District-Muzaffarpur.
6. Sri Shashinath Thakur, Son of Late Tunmun Thakur, Resident of Village- Lohargama Katesar, P.S.-Sakra, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 26-09-2024 Heard Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, learned Advocate for the

petitioner and Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, learned Government

Pleader no. 14.

2. The petitioner by filing the present writ petition seeking a direction upon the respondent to issue revenue receipt of land in question in favour of the petitioner on the basis of Baskit Purcha issued to him vide order dated 25.03.1992 passed by the Circle Officer, Sakra in Baskit Purcha case no. 21/1992-92.

3. The learned Advocate for the petitioner contended



that despite the rent receipt issued in favour of the petitioner in the light of order 25.03.1992 till 2021-2022, the authority concerned has cancelled the same and not issuing any further receipt in the light of an ex-parte order dated 25.07.1997 passed in CWJC No. 1519 of 1996.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the the order as aforementioned was passed without hearing the petitioner and he was not aware of the order and, as such, having found no way out the petitioner approached this Court.

5. Having considered the materials available on record and taking note of the order passed by this Court in CWJC No. 1519 of 1996 which still holds the field good and governs the case of the parties, the present writ petition is wholly misconceived and fit to be dismissed, however, this Court restrained itself from imposing any cost.

6. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

