

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7937 of 2017

=====

Ram Sobhit Sharma son of Late Bhagwat Thakur, resident of Village-
Daulatpur Dewariya, P.S.- Hajipur Sadar, P.O.- Subhai, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Member Administrative Bihar Land Tribunal and Ors
2. The Commissioner, Tirhut Pramandal, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Collector, Vaishali.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Vaishali at Hazipur.
5. Kapildeo Prasad Singh, son of Ramdas Prasad Singh, resident of Village and P.O.- Bhaluyee, P.S.- Raja Pakar, District- Vaishali.
6. Smt. Mamta Rani, daughter of Pravin Prakash, resident of Village and P.O.- Bhaluyee, P.S.- Raja Pakar, District- Vaishali.
7. Ram Nandan Thakur, son of Late Khelawan Thakur, resident of Village- Daulatpur, Dewariya, P.S.- Hajipur Sadar, P.O.- Subahi, District- Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rishi Raj Sinha- Sc19

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 06-01-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present application has been preferred:

*for issuance of appropriate writ,
order or direction to set aside the order
dated 31st of January 2017 (Annexure 4)
passed by Member, Administrative (BLT) by
which he has dismissed the BLT Case no.
746 of 2016 and the order of the
Commissioner dated 02.08.2016 (Annexure
3) passed in Consolidation Revision case no.
113 of 2016 by which he had allowed the
revision application filed by the O.P. No. 1*



and 2 and has set aside the order dated 18th of March 2016 (Annexure 2) passed by the Collector, Vaishali in Land Ceiling Appeal Case NO. R 81/2009-10/84/2010-11 by which he had allowed the appeal filed by the petitioner here against the order dated 4th of December, 2009 (Annexure 1) by which DC LR Vaishali at Hajipur had dismissed the filed by the preemption application petitioner in Land Ceiling Case No. 9/2007 2008 and for stay of the operation of the orders (Annexure 4) during pendency of this application.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with the passage and time and the change of law, the writ petition has become infructuous. However, the amount deposited be allowed to be withdrawn.

4. There is no objection from the other side.

5. The writ petition is disposed of as infructuous allowing the petitioner to withdraw the amount, if any.

6. All the Interlocutory Application(s) also stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

