

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13454 of 2017

=====

Amarjeet Kumar son of Late Krishna Kumar Azad, resident of village-
Barauni-3, Post- Barauni Devadhi, Police Station- Teghara, District-
Begusarai.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar State Election Authority through its Secretary, 32, Harding
Raod, Patna- 800001.
2. The State of Bihar through the Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Govt. of
Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate- cum-District Returning Officer (Co-operative
Societies), Begusarai.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sadar, District- Begusarai.
5. The District Co-operative Officer, Begusarai.
6. The Block Development Officer-cum-Returning Officer, Teghara,
District- Begusarai.
7. The Block Development Officer-cum-Returning Officer, Barauni,
District- Begusarai.
8. The Barauni Co-operative Cold Storage Limited through its Manager,
Barauni, District- Begusarai.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Advocate
: Mr. Vijay Vatsyayan, Advocate

For the Bihar State

Election Commission : Mr. Mukesh Kumar, Advocate

For Respondent No.8 : Mr. Kaushalesh Choudhary, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

4 08-11-2017

I.A. No.7966 of 2017

Mr. Anil Kumar Choudhary, learned counsel submitted
that the petitioner intends to withdraw the writ petition. He
submitted that he would not be pressing the allegations made in
the interlocutory application against Mr. Vijay Vatsyayan, one of
the counsel who had filed writ petition and accepted the



Vakalatnama executed by the petitioner. He submitted that there may be some confusion due to which certain allegations may have been made, but he does not subscribe to the allegations made in the interlocutory application. The petitioner also does not intend to press those allegations. Mr. Vijay Vatsyayan, learned counsel whose name appears as an Advocate for the petitioner is present. He submitted that the petitioner had earlier met him and expressed his desire to withdraw the writ petition. Thereafter, he never turned up. He also submitted that as the petitioner intends to withdraw the writ petition, the same may be disposed of.

Considering the submissions made above, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

I.A. No.7966 of 2017 is disposed of.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Md.S./-

U			
---	--	--	--

