

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1798 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3483 of 2024

=====

Pappu Sah Son of Ram Sundar Sah, Resident of Village- Asogi, P.S. Riga,
District Sitamarhi (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Shri Jai Singh Son of not known to the petitioner, Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. Shri Richie Pandey Son of not known to the petitioner, District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
4. Sri Rakesh Gupta Son of not known to the petitioner, Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Sitamarhi.
5. Sri Mahesh Prasad Chaudhary Son of not known to the petitioner, Circle Officer, Dumra, District Sitamarhi.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Surendra Kishore Thakur, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate
	Mr. Rajan Prakash, AC to GA-02

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 30-01-2026 Heard Mr. Surendra Kishore Thakur, learned counsel
for the petitioner and Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned G.A.-02.

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

*(i) for initiation of a contempt
proceeding against the opposite party
no. 5 for wilfully, deliberately and
intentionally violated the order dated
20.06.2024 passed in CWJC No.*



3483/2024 by the whereby this Court has directed the Circle Officer to dispose of the representation of the petitioner preferably within the period of three months from the date of petition preferred by the writ petitioner.

3. The Circle Officer, Dumra, Sitamarhi is present in the Court. Though, earlier, a show cause was filed, now the second show cause has been filed by the same Officer stating that upon search, it was found that on 27.11.2019 itself, the case related to the petitioner (Case No. 6403R27/2018-2019) was rejected and after hectic search, on 28.01.2026, it came to light. As such, immediate second show cause has been filed. The Officer present in the Court alongwith the file to support the said contention.

4. It is unfortunate that a decision was taken in the year 2019 itself, the Circle Office, Dumra was unaware of it and the same order has now come. However, since an order has been provided, the petitioner has to challenge the same.

5. This Court must observe that if the petitioner challenges the same in next four weeks, the concerned authority shall hear the matter on merit and shall take into account that he



was unaware of the order dated 2019 while dealing with the
limitation petition.

6. The MJC No. 1798 of 2025 is disposed of.

7. The personal appearance of the C.O., Dumra is
dispensed with.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

