

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20110 of 2016

- 1.1. Ramuna Devi Wife of late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.2. Sanjay Kumar Son of Late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.3. Dhanjay Kumar Son of late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.4. Ranjan Sharma Son of late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.5. Manoj Kumar Son of Late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.6. Saroj Kumar Chawanimar Son of late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.
- 1.7. Bashisth Sharma Son of late Ram Bilash Sharma, Resident of Village - Bhartipur, P.S. Maulviganj Pauthu, District- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Commissioner Gaya Division, Gaya.
3. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
4. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms Aurangabad.
5. Rajeshwar Sharma son of Ragho Sharma resident of village Bhartipur, P.O. Maulviganj Paleshu, P.S. Paleshu, District Aurangabad.
6. Smt. Geeta Devi wife of Radhakant Sharma resident of village Angrahi, P.O. Angrahi, P.S. Daudnagar, District Aurangabad - Vendor.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Sharma, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Viveka Nand Singh, AC to GP-18

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 19-01-2026 Heard the parties.

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

i) For quashing the order dated 4.8.2016



passed by the Hon'ble Chairman of the Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 757 of 2015 whereby the Hon'ble Chairman of Land Tribunal Patna was rejected the case of petitioner which is contained in annexure-4 to the writ application.

(ii) For holding and according that pre-emption application filed by the respondent no.5 vide Land Ceiling Case no. 18 of 2008 neither maintainable in law nor on facts and hence fit to be rejected by the Hon'ble Court.

(iii) For any other appropriate relief/reliefs to the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of this case including cost of the litigation.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that with the change of law relating to pre-emption matter, the case has become infructuous.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

5. The amount, if deposited, has to be returned.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

