

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10176 of 2017

Manish Kumar Son of Sri Lalan Pandey, Resident of Mohalla-Company Sarai, Sasaram, P.O. Sasaram, P.S. Sasaram Model, District-Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. THE Principal Secretary, Urban Development and Housing Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram,
5. The District Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram, District-Rohtas at Sasaram
6. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Sasaram, District-Rohtas at Sasaram.
7. Narendra Nath, Son of not Known to the Petitioner, Resident of Mohalla-Chaur Takiya, P.O. Sasaram, P.S. Sasaram District-Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anita Kumari
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Kinkar Kumar-Sc9
	:	Ms. Deepika Sharma, Ac to Sc9
For the R-7	:	Ms. Rekha Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 03-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State along with the learned counsel for the private respondent.

Learned counsel for the private respondent, at the outset, draws the attention of the Court to the order dated 13.03.2023, whereby the learned counsel for the petitioner was granted time for filing a supplementary affidavit, bringing on record, the advertisement and the agreement in pursuance



whereof the petitioner was allotted the shop in question the cancellation of which is being alleged in the present writ application.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite his best endeavors, he could not contact the petitioner, as such, seeks further time for filing supplementary affidavit.

The Court completely fails to appreciate that the writ application was filed in the year 2017, in 2023 sufficient time was granted to the petitioner for bringing on record the documentary evidence, based on which the petitioner claims relief in the writ application, despite indulgence given to the learned counsel for the petitioner today when the matter is taken up, the supplementary affidavit has not been filed on the aforesaid ground as recorded herein above which *prima facie* demonstrates that the writ application was filed seeking relief without substantiating the case based on documentary evidence.

The writ application is thus dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

HarshPandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--

