

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1754 of 2025

Sanjay Kumar singh Son of Late Ram Jyotish Singh Resident of Village and
PO - Bishunpura, P.S. - Bihta, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highway, New Delhi.
2. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The National Highway Authority of India through its Project Director, Project Implementation Unit, Vivekanand Marg, Boring Road, Patna.
4. The Project Director, Project Implementation Unit, NHAI. Vivekanand Marg, Boring Road, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The Competent Authority Cum District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Danapur, Patna.
8. The Circle Officer, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Purushotam Sharma, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Anant Prasad Singh, SC-15
		Mrs. Deepika Sharma, AC to SC-15
For the NHAI	:	Mr. Kumar Goutam, Advocate
For the UOI	:	Mrs. Parul Prasad, CGC
		Mr. Aditya Anand, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AC
to SC-15 for the State, learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the NHAI and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the UOI.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that till
date his land has not been acquired but then petitioner
apprehends that his house and the shop constructed over the
land in dispute in the instant writ application shall be
demolished by the authority on which learned counsel appearing



on behalf of the State and the NHAI submit that the writ application is not maintainable as a specific pleading has been made at para 17 of the writ application that the petitioner apprehends that the authorities may demolish his house and the shop. It is thus submitted that based on apprehension a writ of mandamus cannot be issued.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the writ application with liberty to move afresh if need arises.

4. Permission is accorded.

5. Accordingly, the writ application is dismissed as withdrawn.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

