

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22572 of 2011**

=====

Rajendra Prasad Singh S/O Late Samujhawan Singh @ Shambhu Sharan Singh  
R/O Village- Toya, P.S.- Barbigha, District- Sheikhpura

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Sheikhpura
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sheikhpura
4. The Block Development Officer, Barbigha, District- Sheikhpura
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Sheikhpura
6. The Panchayat Secretary Grampanchayat Toya, P.S.- Barbigha, District - Sheikhpura

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. R.B.N. Singh, AC to GA-10

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**

ORAL JUDGMENT

**Date: 04-10-2018**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs –

*“(i) For quashing the order issued by respondent no. 4 contained in memo no. 1717 dated 30.11.2011 whereby the petitioner has been directed to deposit Rs. 69,753/- which is 20% of total dues amount Rs. 3,48,768/- in lieu of food grains allotted to the petitioner under “Total Rural Employment Scheme” within 2 days failing which an F.I.R. will be lodged in local police station and further an auction letter will be issued.*

*(ii) Also for further direction upon the respondent authorities not to act upon and take any coercive*



*action against the petitioner till disposal of this writ application. .*

*(iii) Also for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that pursuant to the orders of this Court, the Enquiry Commission headed by Hon’ble Mr. Justice Uday Sinha (Retired) has now submitted its report and any further action in relation to recovery of the value of undistributed rice under the SGRY Scheme would abide by the decision of the State Government to be taken on the basis of such report.

4. In the above view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to approach this Court afresh as and when the occasion arises in future.

5. Having regard to the stand of the petitioner, the writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

6. Let the authorities refrain from taking coercive measures against the petitioner until decision is taken by the State Government, as aforesaid.

**(Vikash Jain, J)**

Md. Ibrarul/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | N.A.       |
| Uploading Date    | 08.10.2018 |
| Transmission Date | N.A.       |

