

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19592 of 2015

=====

Satish Mehta @ Satish Chandra Mehta son of Late Kameshwar Mehta,
resident of village- Nawadih Koiri Bigha, P.O. and P.S.- Aurangabad, District-
Aurangabad Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Divisonal Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
3. The District Magistrate cum- Collector, Aurangabad.
4. The Dy. Collector Land Reforms, Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad.
5. Pachiya Devi wife of Sri Kameshwar Mehta resident of village- Kurmaha Tola, Bishun Bigha, P.S.- Jamhore, District- Aurangabad.
6. Krishna Nandan Chaubey son of Late Surajnath Choubey Resident of Village- Ratwar, P.S.- Obra, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kr Singh No. 6, Advocate
Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. GA12-Ajay

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-07-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*“for issuance of appropriate writ(s),
order (s) or direction (s) for quashing of order
dated 07.10.2015 passed in B.L.T. Case No.
198/2015 passed by the Court of Hon'ble
Chairman, the Bihar land Tribunal, Patna whereby
and where under, the B.L.T. Case No. 198 of 2015
filed on behalf of respondents No. 6 and 7 has been
allowed setting aside the order dated 11.12.2014 of
respondent no. 2 passed in land ceiling revision*



case no. 329 /2013, and order dated 22.10.2013 the respondent no. 3 passed in land ceiling appeal no. 62/2011 and the order dated 30.06.2011 of respondents no. 4 passed land dispute case no. 2/10-11 against the petitioner.

Further the respondent no. 5 be directed to transferred the land in question in favour of the petitioner through registered deed in view of section 13 (3) of Bihar land reforms fixation of ceiling Area and question of surplus Land Act 1961.

And/or for any appropriate relief (s) to the petitioner for which he may be found entitled to in the eye of law.”

3. Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the petition.

4. Permission accorded.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

