

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6423 of 2017

=====

Nageshwar Yadav S/o Late Sumar Yadav, Resident of Village- Kajreli, P.O. and P.S.- Kajreli, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector, Bhagalpur.
4. The Sub Divisional Office Sadar, Bhagalpur.
5. The Anchal Adhikari, Nathnagar, Bhagalpur.
6. That Officer-in-Charge, Kajreli, Police Station- Kajreli, District- Bhagalpur.
7. The Chief Executive Officer, Sunni Wakf Board, Patna.
8. Md. Enamul, S/o Md. Mehmud, Resident of Kurman, P.S.- Habibpur, Jagdishpur, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, Adv. Mr. Radha Raman Verma, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sajid Salim Khan- Sc25

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 18-11-2025 Heard Mr. Neeraj Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner and the State.

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

(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in quashing the letter dated 12.02.2017 issued by the Circle Officer, Nathnagar whereby the auction of an orchard of Kajreli Wakf Estate 1739 which was held on 22.01.2017 in favour of the petitioner has



again ordered to be resold re-auctioned on 28.02.2017 in the office of Circle Officer, Nathnagar as contained in Annexure-3.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ in quashing the memo and no. 328 dated 09.03.2017 issued by the Anchal Adhikari, Nathnagar, re-auctioned and re-sold whereby the orchard be trees has been re-settled in favour of Respondent no. 8 namely Md. Enamul.

(iii) For issuance of an appropriate writ commanding the Respondent authorities to restore the earlier bid of auction sale dated 22.01.2017 of the orchard in question which was Settled earlier has been granted of the petitioner as well as compensation in accordance with law.

(iv). For grant of any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled under law as well as facts and circumstances of the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with the passage of time, most of the prayer now has become infructuous but the amount that he had invested in the mango orchard as recorded in paragraph 6, appropriate order has not come so far as the refund part is concerned. He submits that it would suffice his prayer/petition before the Circle Officer, Nathnagar, Bhagalpur (respondent no. 5) has taken note



of/disposed of.

4. The State Counsel has no objection.

5. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of allowing the petitioner to approach the Circle Officer, Nathnagar, Bhagalpur (respondent no. 5) with regard to the refund of the amount which according to him was invested, he has to submit document/proof for the same.

6. If any such petition is preferred, the concerned authority shall look into the matter and pass an appropriate order at an earliest.

7. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

