

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10172 of 2015

-
1. Rakesh Kumar @ Puttu and Anr son of Sri Ram Chandra Thakur.
 2. Smt. Prabha Devi wife of Ram Kumar Tiwari Both are Resident of village-Rampuba @ Repura, P.O. and P.S.- Waini, Dist- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Commissioner, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga.
3. The Addl. Collector, Samastipur Sadar Dist- Samastipur.
4. The Dy. Collector Land Reforms, Samastipur Sadar, Dist- Samastipur.
5. Ram Naresh Thakur son of Late Ram Briksha Thakur, Resident of village-Rampurwa @ Repura, P.o and P.s.- Waini, Dist- Samastipur.
6. Vijay Kumar Thakur son of Late Kewat Thakur, Resident of village-Rampurwa @ Repura, P.o and P.s.- Waini, Dist- Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Amit Bhushan, AC to GP-17

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 16-02-2026 Heard Mr. Keshav Raj, learned counsel for the

petitioners and learned counsel representing the State.

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

*“(i) for issuance of a writ of certiorari
quashing the order dated 21.05.2015 passed by
the Member (Administrative) The Bihar Land
Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 178/2014
whereby the order dated 21.10.2013 passed by
the Divisional Commissioner, Darbhanga
Division, Darbhanga in L.C.R. case no. 45/08-*



09 has been set aside and the case of the respondent no.6 has been allowed.

(ii) for issuance of a writ of certiorari quashing the order dated 01.08.2008 passed by the learned Additional Collector, Samastipur in land ceiling Appeal No. 51/20047-08 passed in favour of the respondent no.6 allowing the appeal after setting aside the order dated 04.06.2007 by the D.C.L.R. Samastipur in land ceiling (preemption) case no. 8/2007 directing the respondent no.6 to transfer the land in question in favour of the petitioner.

(iii) for any other relief(s) for which the petitioner is found to be entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. On the instruction of Mr. Anil Kumar, it is the submission since it is a preemption matter and with the change of law, the matter has become infructuous.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of as become infructuous.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

