

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8513 of 2017**

- 
1. Dilip Rishi
  2. Sanjay Rishi
  3. Ajay Rishi All are sons of Late Jagdish Rishi Residents of Village - Basgara, P.S. K. Nagar Srinagar, District - Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Collector, Purnea.
3. The D.C.L.R. Sadar, Purnea.
4. The C.O., K. Nagar, Purnea.
5. Smt. Siddi Ramaji Wife of Late Ganganand Singh
6. Smt. Manorama Ramaji @ Manorma Devi wife of Kumar Sachidanand Singh Both No. 5 and 6 are residents of Dyarhi Shrinagar, P.S. K. Nagar, District - Purnea.

... .. Respondent/s

---

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                                  |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Birendra Nath Mishra, Adv.<br>Mr. Bijendra Kumar Singh, Adv. |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Birendra Pd. Singh, AC to SC 19                              |

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      16-04-2025                      Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for:-

*“issuance of a writ or writs, direction or directions to the Collector, Purnea to delete the land described hereinafter in this application from the District Purnea gazette Notification no. 4 dated 1.6.1990 published section 15(1) of the Ceiling Act, in as much as the land purchased by the petitioners in the year 1969 have been declared surplus land of the landholder Smt. Manormaji @ Manorma Ramaji without any intention to defeat the provisions of land Ceiling Act.*



*The land so declared surplus land of the landholder has been done without initiating any proceeding under section 5 (1) (III) of the Land ceiling Act and whereby sale and purchase so effected has not been set aside after issuance of any notice, though from the date of purchase till date the petitioners have been in physical cultivating possession over the land of their purchase as the land has been the source of their livelihood.”*

3. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the petition with a liberty to pursue his remedy before the appropriate forum.

4. Without commenting anything on the merit of the case, this Court allows the petitioner to withdraw the petition.

5. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with the liberty aforesaid.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

perwez

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

