

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5189 of 2015

Upendra Singh S/o Ganesh Sharma, resident of Village- Tereni, PS- Masauri,
Dist- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Patna
3. The Settlement officer, Patna
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Land Reforms, Patna.
5. The circle officer, Masauri, Block, Dist- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manish Kumar, GP-4

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

4 18-08-2025 On call, it has been informed by Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Pandey that prior to the year 2020, the file was taken away by the petitioner and thereafter, he has not been given any instruction.

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

“(i) For issuance of a writ in nature of mandamus directing the respondents to correct the Khata No. 298 instead of Khata No. 291 situated at Plot No. 41 area one acre 85 decimal Khata No. 291, Plot No. 714, Khata No. 104 instead of Khata No. 300, 299 Plot No. 538 situated area 75 dismil due to error of the Govt employee at the time of survey be-came in the name of one Brajmohan Singh, Dilkush Singh and Bhuneshwari Devi.

(ii) For directing the respondents to correct the name of the petitioner in the above



stated plot and khata No. which was wrongly became in the name of one Brajmohan Singh, Dilkeshar Singh and Bhuneshwari Devi at the time of survey by the govt employee.

(iii) Any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner is entitled for in the facts and circumstance of the case.”

3. A perusal of the record would show that on 7th July, 2015, prayer for adjournment was made. The matter thereafter came ten years later exactly on 7th July, 2025 when the same prayer was made and this Court recorded that it seems that the petitioner has lost interest in the case, however, as a last chance, list this case on 18.08.2025.

4. Today on call, the information as recorded above has been made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. There is no other vakalatnama on behalf of any other learned counsel.

6. In that background, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

