

Sheo Mali Vs. State and ors

Sheo Mali Vs. State and ors

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1028415

Court : Patna

Decided On : Aug-30-2013

Appellant : Sheo Mali

Respondent : State and ors

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case
No.7039 of 1992

=====

Sheo Mali son of Sohan Mali, resident of village- Amnama, P.O.- Barai, P.S. Islampur, District Nalanda. Petitioner/s Versus 1. The State of Bihar, through Joint Director Consolidation, Purnea, Bihar.

2. Deputy Director Consolidation (Head-quarter), Patna.

3. Consolidation Officer, Hilsa, Nalanda.

4. Karu Singh son of Jawahar Singh, resident of village- Amnama, Tola-Mushahari, P.O. Barai, P.S. Islampur, District- Nalanda. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance : For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Suhawan Singh For the Respondent
No. 1 to 3 : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, AC to GA 8 For the Respondent No. 4 : Mr.
Rewati Kant Raman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA ORAL

JUDGMENT

Date:

30. 08-2013 Heard the parties. By concurrent finding of facts recorded by the respondent Consolidation Officer, Hilsa, respondent Deputy Director of Consolidation, Bihar, Patna as also respondent Joint Director of Consolidation, Purnia, Bihar, in their respective orders as contained in Annexure-3, 2 and 1 respectively, claims of the petitioner with respect to the lands under dispute have been rejected. The impugned order passed by the revisional authority is speaking one and has been passed after taking into consideration all aspects of the matter raised by the parties. The petitioner was given full opportunity of hearing and placing all the materials, yet his claim has been rejected by all the three authorities under the provisions of the Bihar Consolidation of Holdings and Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1956. For the reasons recorded above, particularly in view of the fact that there has been concurrent finding of facts recorded against the petitioner by all the three authorities, this Court does not find any Patna High Court CWJC No.7039 of 1992 dt.30-08-2013 2/2 good ground to interfere with the impugned orders. In the result, the writ petition has to fail and is, accordingly, dismissed. No costs. (Birendra Prasad Verma, J) BTiwary/-

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com