

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21336 of 2018

=====

Lakshmi Prasad son of Musai Sah, Resident of Pokhariapir, Atardah, Post-Ramna, P.S. Sadar, District Muzaffarpur, Presently resident of Sadpur Mahamaya Chauk, P.O.- Ramna, P.S. Kaji Mohammadpur, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate-cum- Collector, Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.
3. The Chairman, Muzaffarpur Municipal Corporation, Muzaffarpur, District-Muzaffarpur.
4. The Circle Officer, Town Police Station, P.S. Sadar, Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur
5. The Officer-in Charge, Town Police Station, P.S. Sadar, Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sumeet Kumar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Anmol Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14
For the Resp No. 3	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 14-10-2025 Heard Mr. Anmol Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, the State, Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad and Mr. Awadhesh Kumar representing the Muzaffarpur Municipal Corporation (for brevity ‘the Corporation).

2. The present petition has been preferred for the following relief(s):

“i. That the present writ application is being filed in the nature of Mandamus for a direction to Muzaffarpur Municipal Corporation as



well as the Collector, Muzaffarpur to pay compensation of the land of 11.8 ft., total-1563 square feet situated in Plot No. 634, Khata No. 177, Thana No. 342 Muhalla Pokhariyapur, Anchal Musahari, District Muzaffarpur which has been taken by the Respondent Authority without giving compensation and the same was part of 1 acre 72 decimal of land which was in the share of the petitioner and his brothers as per the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Re-Settlement Act, 2013(herein after referred as "the Act, 2013" for the sake of brevity);

ii. For any other relief/Reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled for."

3. At the outset, learned counsel for 'the Corporation' has produced two documents to show that the petitioner preferred two writ petitions bearing CWJC No. 21324 of 2018 (Lakshmi Prasad vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.) and the present CWJC No. 21336 of 2018 (Lakshmi Prasad vs. the State of Bihar & Ors.) and letter dated 15.10.2022 and 24.09.2025 addressed to 'the Corporation' shows that the petitioner made a submission that he wants to withdraw both the writ petitions and



has no problem in the construction of the drainage being constructed by 'the Corporation.

4. The submission is that CWJC No. 21324 of 2018 already stands disposed of 09.11.2020 on the basis of said petition preferred by the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner concurs to the said submission put forward by the learned counsel for 'the Corporation'.

6. This Court is having copies of both the petitions preferred by the petitioner which shall be part of the record and the letter dated 24.09.2025 clearly supports the contention of the learned counsel for 'the Corporation'.

7. In that background, the writ petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

