

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7426 of 2026

1. Ram Nath Pandey Son of Late Deen Bahadur Pandey, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
2. Sunil Pandey @ Sunil Kumar Pandey, Son of Late Ram Bilash Pandey, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
3. Ram Naresh Bambam, Son of Late Ram Sogarath Pandey, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Deputy Director, Consolidation (Head Quarter) Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director of Consolidation, Vaishali at Hajipur.
4. Jai Chand Ram, Son of Late Tapeswar Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
5. Bindeshwar Ram, Son of Late Tapeswar Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
6. Mithlesh Ram, Son of Late Shivchandra Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
7. Akhalesh Ram, Son of Late Shivchandra Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
8. Sakuntla Devi, Wife of Late Shivchandra Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
9. Suresh Ram, Son of Late Sukeswar Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.
10. Upendra Ram, Son of Late Sukeswar Ram, Resident of Village- Bejha, P.O.- Rajapakar, P.S.- Rajapakar, District- Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Subodh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Shweta Anand, AC to GP-13

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-07-2026 Heard the parties.

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



“(i). For quashing of the order dated 07.10.1998 passed by the Deputy Director, Consolidation (Head Quarter) Bihar, Patna, in Revision Case No. 320/96 filed under Section 35 of the Bihar Consolidation of Holdings and Prevention of Fragmentation Act. The said revision application filed by the private respondent was allowed ex-parte without considering that the private respondent, by suppressing facts, filed the application directly before the office of the Deputy Director, Consolidation (Headquarter) Bihar, Patna, under Section 35 of the Act suppressing that earlier a Title Suit had filed by the ancestor of the private respondent against the ancestor of the petitioners for a declaration of title, which was ultimately decided in favour of the ancestor of the petitioners.

(ii). For further direction to the respondent authorities not to act in terms of the order dated 07.10.1998 or to give any effect to the order, with a further holding that the private respondent could not acquire any right on the basis



of the said order, and/or pass any such order/orders which Your Lordships may deem fit and proper.”

3. On 23.06.2026, an order was passed to remove the defect(s) within a period of two weeks.

4. As it was a peremptory order and the defect(s) was not removed, it got dismissed on 07.07.2026.

5. Perused the file and the same stands consigned.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

