

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7367 of 2015

=====

Kamaleshwari Mandal Son of Late Kharapi Mandal, Resident of Village-
Kamalpur Sajaur Shahkund, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director, Fisheries, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Bhagalpur Division, Bhagalpur.
4. The District Magistrate, Bhagalpur.
5. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Bhagalpur.
6. S.H.O., Sajour Shahkund Police Station, Bhagalpur.
7. The District Fisheries Officer, Bhagalpur.
8. Bhushi Mandal, Son of Late Bhikhari Mandal, Secretary, Shahkund
Prakhand Matasyajivi Sahyog Samiti Ltd., village- Belthu, P.S. Shahkund,
District- Bhagalpur.
9. Sanjay Mandal, Son of Late Gudar Mandal, Resident of village- Kamalpur
Sajour Shahkund, District- Bhagalpur.
10. Singheshwar Mandal.
11. Kishori Mandal. Both sons of Late Pecho Mandal, Residents of village-
Kamalpur Sajour Shahkund, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. B.P. Mandal, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Ms. Sweta Anand, AC to GP-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 08-07-2025 Heard Mr. B.P. Mandal, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Ms. Sweta Anand, learned AC to GP-13.

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

(i) for setting aside the Order dated



30.01.2015 passed in Fisheries Appeal No.8/2013-14 where under and whereby the appeal filed by the Petitioner u/s 14 (i) of Bihar Fish Jalkar Management Act 2006 has been rejected by a non speaking order. And for a direction upon the respondents to allow the petitioner to continue with the settlement made with the petitioner for Session 2014-2015 after cancelling the settlement made with private respondents No.9 to 11 in the light of Memo No.942 dated 03.12.2014 issued by the District Fisheries Officer, Bhagalpur;

(ii) and/or pass such other order/orders as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of this case.

3. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner concedes that with the passage of time, the petition has become infructuous. However, he submits that the petitioner suffered some monetary loss for which he shall be agitating the matter before the concerned authority.

4. Granting said liberty, the writ petition is disposed



of.

5. Pending Interlocutory Application(s), if any also
stand(s) disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

