

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2374 of 2024

Suresh Singh son of Sheo Dahin Singh resident of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS-Tarari, District, Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Revenue, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Member Board of Revenue Government of Bihar
3. The Collector Bhojpur
4. Terari Devi Wife of Rajendra Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
5. Vinay Kumar S/o Bir Bahadur Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
6. Munna Kumar S/o Bir Bahadur Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
7. Binod Singh S/o Gama Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO- Khutah,
PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
8. Manoj Singh S/o Gama Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
9. Bikram Singh S.o Ramadhar Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd PO-
Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur
10. Chandrama Singh S/o Ramadhar Singh Residents of Village- Moapkhurd
PO- Khutah, PS- Tarari, District- Bhojpur

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kishore Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. A.C. to G.A.-2

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 16-05-2024 Heard Mr. Kishore Kumar Sinha, learned Counsel
for the petitioner and learned A.C. to G.A.-2 for the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following reliefs:-

*(i) for quashing of the order dated
04.03.02 (Annexure -2 series) passed by
respondent no. 2 in analogous Revision Case no*



157 of 2001, 158 of 2001, 159 of 2001 and 160 of 2001 (heard analogous) by which the revision application of the petitioner have been dismissed on the ground of limitations;

(ii) further, for a direction to the respondent No. 2 to hear the revision applications of the petitioner on merit and further to grant any other relief, which the petitioner are entitled.

3. Though the learned Counsel for the petitioner tried his level best to impress this Court on the merit, in view of the fact that the order under challenge is of the year 2002 (to be precise order dated 04.03.2002) passed by the Additional Member, Board of Revenue, Bihar, Patna (Suresh Singh vs Vikram Singh), this Court, unfortunately, cannot extend any relief as much water has flown down the *ganges* since last 22 years and there is inordinate delay in the matter.

4. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Neha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

