

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9421 of 2017

=====

Rajendra Chaudhary son of Late Ram Das Chaudhary, Resident of Village-
Jamalpur Pokhaha, P.O. Atimi, P.S. Nasriganj, District Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. The Circle Officer, Nasariganj, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. The Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Ltd, Patna through the Managing Director.
6. The Managing Director, The Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Ltd, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. S.B.K. Mangalam, Advocate
	:	Ms. Anita Kumari, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Nutan Sahay, AC to AAG-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 03-02-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*“(i) for issuance of an appropriate writ in
the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and
directing the Respondent Authorities to stop the
construction of approach road passing through
the Raiyati land of the petitioner being Khata
No.37, Plot No.1155 , area 1.32 decimals on the
ground that if the petitioner is Khatiyani Raiyat
of the aforesaid land, the Respondents cannot
construct the approach road in the land of the*



petitioner without adhering to a proper acquisition proceeding to acquire the land of the petitioner and without compensation to the petitioner.

(ii) for issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Authorities for payment of cost/compensation of the petitioner's land bearing Khata No.37, Plot No.1155 in accordance with law before they go for construction of approach road through the petitioner's land.

(iii) for issuance of any other 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 he may be permitted to withdraw the petition.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

