

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7313 of 2024

=====

Tinku Paswan Son of Sahdeo Paswan, Resident of Mohalla- Raniganj,
Paswan Tola, Ward No.-4, P.O.Maryganj, P.S. Raniganj, District- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Urban Development and Housing Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Purnea Division, Purnea.
4. The Nagar Panchayat, Raniganj, P.O. and P.S. Raniganj, District- Araria.
5. The Executive Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Raniganj, P.O. and P.S. Raniganj, District- Araria.
6. Murli Manohar Singh, Son of not known to the petitioner, Resident of Mohalla- Raniganj, Ward No. 17, P.O. Maryganj, P.S. Raniganj, District- Araria.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Awnish Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Government Pleader 06
For respondent no. 4&5	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar, AC to SC-15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

5 27-04-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) for issuance of an appropriate writ in the
nature of order dated CERTIORARI for
quashing the 15.04.2024 passed by the
Respondent no.3 and contained in his memo
no.372 dated 15.04.2024 whereby and where*



under the Respondent no.3 has been pleased to direct the Respondent no.5 to allow the Respondent no.6 for collection of tax of two Sairats till 06.06.2024 and thereafter to take fresh auction for settlement of Sairat in question in accordance with law fixing Rs.62 Lacs as the minimum reserved price;

(ii) for issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities not to disturb the petitioner in collection of Sairat in view of the settlement notice. Issued by the Respondent no.5 followed by the agreement dated 01.04.2024 in between the petitioner and the Respondent no.5, according to which the two Sairats were settled with the petitioner from 01.04.2024 to 31.03.2025;

(iii) for a declaration that since the settlement of Sairat is not covered by the Model Code of Conduct prescribed by the Election Commission of India in exercise of its power under Article 324 of the



Constitution of India, the impugned order passed by the Respondent no.3 cancelling the petitioner's contract with the Respondent no.5 is thoroughly Illegal, arbitrary and malafide;

(iv) for issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs. order/ orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioner would be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case..

3. Mr. S.B.K. Mangalam, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with the passage of time, the writ petition has become infructuous.

4. As such, the same stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

