

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1346 of 2024

=====

Raju Kumar Singh S/o Late Ram Raj Singh, R/o Village-South Ekawana, P.S.
Udwantnagar, District Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Bhojpur at Ara.
4. The S.D.O. Sadar Ara, District Bhojpur.
5. The Circle Officer, Udwantnagar Anchal, District Bhojpur at Ara.
6. S.H.O. Udwant Nagar Police Station, District Bhojpur.
7. Raghwendra Pratap Singh S/o Late Ambika Saran Singh, R/o Mohalla Maulabag, P.S. Ara Nawada, District Bhojpur, Ara, Pin Code-802301.
8. Pallavi Priya @ Sweta D/o Raghvendra Pratap Singh, R/o Mohalla Maulabag, P.S. Ara Nawada, District Bhojpur, Ara, Pin Code-802301.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Ambastha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Standing Counsel (18)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

5 28-10-2024 The present writ petition has been filed seeking the
following relief:-

“1(i) For issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or directions to the respondents to protect the right title and possession of the petitioner over the land, situated at Mauza Ekawana, appertaining to Khata No.62, Khesra No.638, admeasuring 65 decimal, under Anchal-Udwant Nagar, Thana No.354, in view of order passed in 145 Cr.P.C. proceedings, vide order dated 26.2.1980 in Case No.375/73.



(ii) For issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or directions upon the respondents to maintain peaceful possession of the petitioner over his land and further restrain the respondent no.7 from disturbing the peaceful possession of the petitioner, who is adamant to disturb the possession of the petitioner and also not change the nature of land inasmuch as the respondent No. 7 is forcefully filing soil upon the land of the petitioner.

(iii) For issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to protect the constitutional right guaranteed under Article 300 (A) of the Constitution of India.”

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievances of the petitioner have stood redressed during the interregnum period, hence he does not wish to press the present writ petition, however submits that in case he is so aggrieved in future, he shall be approaching the respondent-authorities/taking recourse to the due process of law.

3. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed off as not pressed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

kanchan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

