

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12860 of 2016

-
-
1. Hridaya Nand Pandey and Anr son of Late Pati Ram Pandey
 2. Abhinandan Pandey son of Hridya Nand Pandey Both residents of Village Jagapakar, P.S.- Harsidhi District- East Champaran at Motihari.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary, Animal and Fisheries Department.
3. The District Fisheries Officer-cum-Chief Executive Officer, East Champaran, Motihari.
4. The Circle Officer, Harsidhi, East Champaran, Motihari.
5. Sri Paras Choudhary @ Paras Sahani son of Late Nagina Sahani, Mantri, Harsidhi Prakhand Matasayajibi Sahyog Samiti Ltd., Harsidhi East Resident of Village Bairiyadiha, P.S. Harsidhi, District East Champaran.
6. Chanar Sahni Son of Late Singheshwar Sahani resident of Village-Bairiyadiha, P.S. Harsidhi, District East Champaran, Motihari, Member, Harsidhi Prakhand, Matasajibi Sahyog Samiti Ltd, Harsidhi, East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amar Nath Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Subhash Chandra Yadav- Gp15

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) For issuance of writ of
certiorari quashing the settlement of Jalkar
namely Jagapakar being Khata no. 423 Plot
no. 721, 1158, 2280, 3006 Area 1.60 Acres
made in favour of Respondent no. 5 for the
year 2012-13 to 2018-19 by respondent no.2*



vide order contained in letter no. 556 dated 28.09.2012 as the land belong to the petitioner.

(ii) For issuance of writ of mandamus directing the pond Respondents to remove the said pond from the Sairat list and pay the Revenue to the petitioners Collected from the settlee against the settlement made in 2012-13 as the said Jalkar is the personal property of the petitioners and the Respondents have no right to settle the same.

(iii) For any other relief for which the petitioners are be entitled in the facts and found to circumstances of the case.

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that short adjournment be granted, learned GP-14 wanted the Court to look at the prayer itself which relates to the settlement of Jalkar for the period 2012-13 to 2018-19 and submits that with the passage of time, it has become infructuous.

4. This Court has taken note of the fact as also the Annexure-7, the settlement order no. 556 dated 28.09.2012 issued by the District Fisheries Officer, East Champaran, Motihari. It was for a period of seven years which came to an end in the year 2019 and we are in the year 2025.

5. There is no further affidavit regarding its



continuance or any Interlocutory application warranting further order in the matter.

6. In the background, treating the writ petition to be infructuous, disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

