

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8145 of 2016

-
1. Jitendra Prasad son of Late Vishwanath Prasad resident of Ward No. 15, Opposite S.R.K. Goyanka College, P.S. & District-Sitamarhi.
 2. Shankar Prasad son of Ramrup Prasad resident of Ward No. 15, Opposite S.R.K. Goyanka College, P.S. & District-Sitamarhi.
 3. Md. Habib son of Later Jahir Hussain resident of Ward No. 15, Opposite S.R.K. Goyanka College, P.S. & District-Sitamarhi.
 4. Abdul Samad son of Saukat Ali resident of Ward No. 15, Opposite S.R.K. Goyanka College, P.S. & District-Sitamarhi
 5. Safdar Ali son of Saukat Ali resident of Ward No. 15, Opposite S.R.K. Goyanka College, P.S. & District-Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. The Collector, Sitamarhi.
3. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Sitamarhi.
4. The Deputy Collector Incharge, Khas Mahal, Sitamarhi
5. The Circle Officer, Sitamarhi.
6. The Principal, S.R.K. Goyanka College, Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None
For the Respondent/s :

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 09-02-2026 No one appears on call.

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

*“(i) for issuance of writ in the appropriate
nature for quashing of the Notice dated*



19.09.2005 and 23.09.2005 issued under the signature of the Deputy Collector, Khas Mahal whereby and where under the notices has been given to these petitioners for deposit of rent of Rs. 37,696/-, Rs.19,667/- and Rs.2,53,937/- respectively except reserving amount for the financial year 2005-06 without considering and hearing of the parties that previous rent has already been deposited and the rent fixed by the respondents authority are excessive.

(ii) for further direction to the respondents authority to consider the case of the petitioners and after hearing the parties fix afresh rent according to law and recalculate the rent deposited by these petitioners.

(iii) and for any other relief/reliefs for which petitioners are found to be entitled in the eye of law.”

3. The prayer clearly show that notices were issued to the petitioners by the respondents and instead of replying to the said notice, they rushed to this Court.

4. The counter affidavit of the Deputy Collector Land



Reforms, Sitamarhi shows that some of the petitioners deposited rent against their shops and since the audit objected to the pending amounts, notice issued.

5. Instead of reply to the notice, the writ petition. The affidavit also shows that the notices were issued in the year 2005-06 and challenge was made ten years later in the year 2016.

6. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

