

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5177 of 2026

-
1. Krishna Kumar Son of Late Ram Babu Rai, Resident of Dujra, Devi Asthan Mukhya Gali, P.S.-Buddha Colony, Distt. - Patna.
 2. Baijnath Prasad, Son of Late Ram Babu Rai, Resident of Beside Plot No. 1028, Near Hospito India Buddha Colony, P.S.-Buddha Colony, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Addl. Chief Secretary, Land and Revenue Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Addl. Chief Secretary, Land and Revenue Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Secretary, Cum Second Appellate Authority, Public Grievance Redressal Cell, Town Development and Housing Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Divisional Commissioner, Patna.
5. Managing Director, Bihar Urban Infrastructure Development Corporation (BUIDCO), Patna.
6. District Magistrate, Patna.
7. Addl. Collector, Patna.
8. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Patna Sadar.
9. Circle Officer, Patna Sadar.
10. Circle Amin, Patna Sadar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhananjai Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Anirban Kundu, SC-24

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) for Setting Aside the order dt. 11.2.2026,
passed by Departmental Urban*



*Development and Housing Department
Govt. of Bihar Cum IInd Appellate Authority,
Public Grievance Redressal Cell, Patna,
whereby and Whereunder it has been held
that, as Petitioners have not raised
construction over disputed land, he was not
the owner of land in question;*

*(ii) for Setting Aside the Order dt.
26.12.2024, passed by Divisional
Commissioner, Patna Cum First Appellate
Authority, Public Grievance Redressal Cell,
Patna.*

*(iii) for, Setting Aside order dt. 21.8.2024,
passed by District Public Grievance
Redressal Authority, Patna;*

*(iv) for holding that, reason (i.e. no
construction over disputed land,) assigned
by Respondents for depriving the
Petitioners, from payment of compensation
is not sustainable in the eye of law;*

*(v) for holding that, Ganga Barrage Act
1975 is not in existence, as mentioned by*



*Respondents for rejecting the claim of
Petitioners;*

*(vi) for Commanding and Directing the
Respondents to consider the documents, (i.e.
Khatiyani, Registered Sale Deed, Jamabandi
Receipt) furnished by the Petitioners, and to
pass a reasonable and speaking order in
accordance with law;*

*(vii) for holding that, without considering
the documents filed by the Petitioners, no
order should have been passed by the
Respondents;*

*(viii) for any other relief(s) for which
Petitioner is found entitled in the eye of law.*

3. Mr.Dhananjai Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the petition.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as
withdrawn.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

