

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7889 of 2017

1. Sikandar Rai @ Sikendar Rai
2. Madheshwar Rai
3. Aklesh Rai All sons of Late Jai Kant Rai @ Late Jayakanta Ray, Resident of Village-Katsa, P.S.-Bheldi, District-Saran Chhapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Additional Member Board of Revenue, Bihar, Patna.
3. THE Collector, Saran Chhapra
4. The Additional Collector, Saran Chhapra
5. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Maraurdha, Sadar-Chhapra, District-Saran, Chhapra
6. Laxmi Rai
7. Dilip Rai
8. Raj Kumar All Sons of late Ram Kishore Rai, Resident of Village-Kasta, P.S.-Bheldi, District-Saran Chhapra
9. Maina Devi D/o Late Ram Kishore Rai, W/o Tribhuwan Rai
10. Naina Devi D/o Late Ram Kishore Rai, W/o Gurucharan Rai, Both Resident of Village-Adilpur, P.S.-Dariyapur, District-Saran Chhapra

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the State	:	Mr. Sajid Salim Khan-SC-25
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Mahesh Narayan Parbat, Sr. Advocate Mr. Ved Prakash Srivastave, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

4 16-04-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though learned Senior Counsel for the respondent nos. 6 to 10 as also the State are present.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the following relief(s):

“for setting aside of the order dated 06.02.2017 (Annexure-5) passed by the Learned Additional Member Board of Revenue, Bihar, Patna (Respondent no. 2) passed in Revision (Land Ceiling Pre-emption) Case No. 120/2004 rejecting the



revision application filed by the petitioners and affirm the order passed by the Learned Collector, dated 30.12.2003 passed in Ceiling Appeal No. 33/1991(Annexure-2) filed by the petitioners by which the Learned Additional Collector (Respondent no. 4) has been pleased to set aside the order dated 30.10.1991 (Annexure-1) passed by the Learned Land Reforms Deputy Collector (Respondent no. 5) by which the pre-emption application filed by the father of the respondent no. 6 to 10 has been rejected, the Order contained in Annexure-5 and Annexure-2 have illegally been passed which are under challenge here.”

3. At the outset, learned Senior Counsel submits that the matter has been compromised and as such, the petitioners are not appearing in this case.

4. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

