

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18280 of 2017

=====

Ramchandra Mehta Son of Chuwa Mandal, Resident of Village-Jhitkiahi,
Police Station Pipra, District Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate Supaul.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Supaul.
4. The officer-in-Charge, Pipra, District Supaul.
5. Ramdeo Yadav Son of late Kalat Yadav.
6. Manoj Yadav Son of Ramdeo Yadav
7. Pramod Yadav Son of Ramdeo Yadav.
8. Ashok Yadav Son of Bidyanand Yadav.
9. Siyalala Yadav Son of Lootan Yadav.
10. Upendra Mehta Son of Lakshuman Mehta.
11. Yogendra Mehta Son of Lakhuman Mehta, No. 5 to 11 Resident of Village-Jhitkiahi, Police Station Pipra, District Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Nutan Sahay, AC to AAG-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 23-06-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though

State is present.

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

*“for direction to the District Magistrate, Supaul
as well as the Superintendent of Police, Supaul
to control the illegal activities of the private
respondents because the dispute has been*



decided by this Hon'ble High Court, Patna in C.W.J.C.No. 2092 of 1996 on 14.5.2015 and the same dispute has also been decided in C.W.J.C. No. 127 of 1980 on 26.2.1985. The petitioner prays that a direction may be given to the respondents not to disturb the possession of the petitioner as the petitioner was/is in peaceful possession over the land in question by the order of the competent authority. The petitioner further prays that a direction may also be given to the Officer-in-charge, Pipra to provide proper security to the petitioner as well as his family members as the private respondents are the criminals, Lathials and terror of the society. If the security is not allowed, there is chance for the blood-shed. Therefore, for the ends of justice equity demands that a direction may be given to the Officer-in-charge to safeguard the possession of the petitioner over disputed land bearing Khata no. 221, plot no. 4810, area 12 Kathas 11 Dhurs situated in village Amhar, Thana Pipra under the district of Supaul.”



3. Mrs. Nutan Sahay submits that instead of moving before an appropriate court/authority , against private respondents the writ petition has been filed.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

