

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9124 of 2017

=====

Garbhu Das son of Kalpu Das, resident of Village- Gangdah, Police Station-
Baheri, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Commissioner Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga.
3. The District Magistrate, District- Darbhanga.
4. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Sadar Benipur, District- Darbhanga.
5. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Benipur, District- Darbhanga.
6. The Circle Officer, Baheri, District- Darbhanga.
7. The Anchal Amin, Circle Office, Baheri, District- Darbhanga.
8. Brajesh Yadav.
9. Mithilesh Yadav. Both Sons of Dhyani Yadav. Both resident of Village-
Gangdah, Police Station- Baheri, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 17-06-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though the

State is present.

2. The present writ petition has been preferred for the

following relief(s):

*“I. For issuance of a writ in the nature of
mandamus directing and commanding to the
respondent Circle Officer, Baheri, District-
Darbhanga to make demarcation of plot no.513,
Khata no.198 area 8 katha situated in village
Gangdah, Police Station-Baheri, District-
Darbhanga, for that the petitioner has already*



deposited Rs.732/- as Amin fee in the Nazarat of Circle Office on 13.6.2015 but till date the demarcation has not been made by the Circle Amin and report has not been sent to the Circle Officer.

II. For issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing and commanding to the respondent nos. 8 and 9 to not disturb the petitioner from the peaceful possession over the aforesaid land.

III. To pass such other order or order's as may deem fit and proper."

3. Learned counsel for the State at the outset submits that the demarcation has already been done and the same has been put on record by way of paragraph-8 of the counter-affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent nos. 3 to 6 and there is no reply to the said counter-affidavit also.

4. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance, the same is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

