

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6330 of 2025

=====

Veena Devi Wife of Rameshwar Prasad Singh, resident of Village-Bamoura,
P.S. Bazidpur, District-Samastipur, Bihar, PIN-848503.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Planning and Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna-800015.
2. The Principal Secretary, Planning and Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna-800015.
3. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
4. The Circle Officer, Vidyapati Nagar, District-Samastipur.
5. The Block Development Officer, Vidyapati Nagar, District-Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Anuradha Singh, SC- 21

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 07-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the instant writ application has been filed for a direction upon the respondent authorities to remove the construction, which has been illegally made on the land of the petitioner pertaining to Khata no.961, Plot No.1822, Area- 68 decimal at Village-Bamaura, Bajidpur, Block Office- Vidyapati Nagar, Samastipur. Further, to remove the construction made by the respondent authority on the 15 ft. road, which is public land, connecting the aforesaid land of the petitioner with NH-122B, leaving the



approach road 7 ft. wide causing great hardship to the petitioner and other residents of the said locality. Further to restrain the respondent authorities from making further construction on the aforesaid plot of the petitioner and the passage connecting the aforesaid plot with NH-122B.

3. Learned State Counsel submits that a counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent nos. 3 to 5 has been filed and from perusal of Annexure-A to the counter affidavit, it would manifest that the same is a compromise entered in between the petitioner and the Circle Officer, Samastipur. As such, the dispute which has arisen stands resolved amicably based on the compromise entered in between the petitioner and the Circle Officer, Samastipur, dated 29.06.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the copy of the counter affidavit was served on him on 04.07.2025 but then he has not been in a position to seek instructions with regard to the compromise.

5. On which, the learned State Counsel submits that since compromise has been entered, as such, the petitioner has lost interest in the case.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned State Counsel and also taking into consideration the



compromise dated 29.06.2025 entered between the petitioner and the Circle Officer, Samastipur, the Court is not persuaded to entertain the writ application any further. As such, the writ application is disposed of in terms of the compromise dated 29.06.2025 (Annexure-A).

7. However, it is made clear that in the event if it is found that no compromise was entered in between petitioner and the Circle Officer, Samastipur, in that event the petitioner would be at liberty to file an application seeking to recall the instant order.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

shikha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

