

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8835 of 2020

=====

Pappu Kumar, Male, aged about 36 years, son of Shri Shibendra Kumar Yadav, Resident of Ward No. 10, Near Bajrang Bali Mandir, Nipania Latauna Uttar, P.S. Triveniganj, District-Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Kosi Division, Saharsa
4. The Collector, Supaul
5. The Additional Collector, Supaul
6. The District Nazir, District Nazareth, Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhay Shankar Jha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Srivastava, AC to GP 15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN
AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 19-03-2021

The matter has been heard *via* video conferencing.

2. Heard Mr. Abhay Shankar Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rakesh Kumar Srivastava, learned AC to GP 15 for the State.

3. The petitioner has moved the Court for the following reliefs:

“i. For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus or an appropriate writ or order or direction commanding upon the Respondents to refund Rs. 18,03,600/- with due interest, which has been deposited by the petitioner in the District



Nazareth, Supaul against the settlement of Sairat of Ramnavami Mela, Triveniganj for the Financial Year 2020-21, since the said Ramnavami mela, Triveniganj had been completely hampered due to complete lockdown, considering pandemic COVID 19 and surge of Corona Infection Cases in the State of Bihar and in this country.
ii. Any other relief for which the petitioner may be found entitled in the facts and circumstances of this case.”

4. In the supplementary counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondents no. 3 to 6, it transpires that the amount of Rs. 18,03,600/- deposited by the petitioner has been returned to him through cheque which he has received on 15.03.2021. The said fact not being controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner, the Court finds that nothing further remains in the present application.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

