

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5763 of 2020

=====

M/s. Aditya Multicom Private Limited, a Company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at 12, Waterloo Street, 2nd Floor, Kolkata-700069, through its Authorized Signatory, Kamlesh Gaurav @ Kamlesh Gouaraw, aged about 29 years (Male), son of Shri Surendra Singh, resident of 86, Thana Pakridayal, Rajepur Nawada, Kotwa, Hussaini, District Purbi Champaran, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800001.
2. The Principal Secretary-cum-Commissioner, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800001.
3. The Special Secretary-cum-Director, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800001.
4. The Additional Secretary, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Vikas Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna-800001.
5. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Aurangabad.
6. The Mining Development Officer, Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Suraj Samdarshi, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Gyan Prakash Ojha (G.A. 7)
For Mining	:	Mr. Naresh Dikshit, (S.P.P. Mining)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 29-11-2021 Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

“(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in



the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent authorities to collect the settlement amount for the extended period of settlement, in six equal monthly installments, for the remaining amount payable to the respondents.

(ii) For a direction to the respondent authorities not to insist upon payment for the extended period in terms of letter no. 2922 dated 28.12.2019 Issued by the respondent no. 6.

(iii) To adjudicate and hold that since continuance of mining is by way of extension, the terms and conditions remain the same as that of original lease/settlement, as the same is not renewal rather extension.

(iv) To further adjudicate that since the extension of the period is contingent upon news settlees obtaining environmental clearance, compelling the petitioner to pay the entire settlement amount within a period of less than three months is not only arbitrary and unreasonable, rather is in conflict with the existing terms of settlement.

(v) For a direction to the respondent authorities not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner for the delay in deposit of installments, till final adjudication of the present writ application; and for any other relief(s) to which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition for the reason that the grievances of the



petitioner stand redressed.

Petition is disposed of as having become infructuous.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

K.C.Jha/-Veena

U			
---	--	--	--

