

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11324 of 2023**

=====

Rajnandan Prasad S/o Deoki Lal, R/o Dariyapur, Mithanchak, P.S. Parsa Bazar, Dist - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Patna, Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Patna.
3. The Chief General Manager, Bihar State Road Development Corporation, Sheikhpura, Patna.
4. The Director, the Land Acquisition Department, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The Circle Officer, Phulwarisharif, Patna.
7. The Project Manager, the Afcons Infrastructure Limited, D-8, Sudha Home Town Apartment, Pipra, Parsa Bazar Sampatchak Road, Patna.
8. Mrs. Anita Devi, W/o Mr. Sunil Kumar, resident of Jhaichak, P.S. - Persa Bazar, Dist. - Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                  |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | None                             |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Raj Kishore Roy, GP-18       |
| For the Resp. No.3   | : | Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Advocate     |
|                      | : | Mr. Manish Dhari Singh, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      10-03-2026                      No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though State as also learned counsel for the Bihar State Road Development Corporation is present.

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

*“for direction/directions or order/orders or writ or writs in the nature of mandamus to stop the the payment of rent to respondent no.8 on the*



*basis of the judgment passed by the Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in BLT Case No. 714/2017 and pendency of title partition suit no. 256/2010, Civil Court, Patna.”*

3. Learned State counsel submits that a Title Partition Suit No. 256 of 2010 is pending before the learned Sub-Judge, Patna and the petitioner should have raised all the points before the said court instead the writ petition.

4. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

vinayak/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

