

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.440 of 2025

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3806 of 2025

=====

Shivji Das, S/o Sahdev Das, R/o Ward- 05, Village- Pakri Tole- Hanuman Nagar, P.S. - Riga, District- Sitamarhi- 843302.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi, Bihar.
4. The District Panchayat Raj Officer, Sitamarhi, Bihar.
5. The Executive Officer cum Block Development Officer (Panchayat Samiti), Riga, Sitamarhi.
6. The Circle Officer, Riga, Sitamarhi.
7. The Mukhiya, Gram Panchayat Pakri Mathwa, P.O. and P.S. - Riga, Sitamarhi, Bihar, through The Executive Officer cum Block Development Officer (Panchayat Samiti), Rita, Sitamarhi.
8. The Panchayat Sachiv, Gram Panchayat Pakri Mathwa, P.O. and P.S. - Riga, Sitamarhi, Bihar, through The Executive Officer cum Block Development Officer (Panchayat Samiti), Rita, Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr.Bipin Bihari, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ajay, Government Advocate (5)
		Mr. Pratik Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 20-08-2025 Heard Mr. Bipin Bihari, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant and Mr. Pratik Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant, at the outset,



submitted that the appellant challenged the notice issued by the concerned authority in the captioned writ petition. However, appellant/writ-petitioner came to know subsequently that now the decision has been taken by the respondent authority for construction of the Panchayat Bhawan at a particular site. He, therefore, seeks permission to withdraw the present appeal with a view to challenge the decision taken by the respondent authority.

3. Permission, as prayed for, is granted.

4. Letters Patent Appeal stands disposed of as withdrawn.

5. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

6. It is clarified that we have not examined the merits of the case of the appellant.

(Vipul M. Pancholi, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

P.K.P./-

U			
---	--	--	--

