

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20353 of 2025**

Prabhakaran Son of Lalan Kumar Deo, Permanent resident of PNB Gali, Beside Rajdarwar Hotel, Police Station and District- Saharsa. Presently residing at J-3/77, Ground Floor, Left side Khirki EXTN, Shiv Kunj, Malviya Nagar, S.O., P.S.- Malviya Nagar, District- South Delhi, Pin- 110017.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner, Kosi Division, Saharsa.
2. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Saharsa.
4. The Circle Officer, Kahra, District- Saharsa.
5. The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division, Saharsa.
6. The Municipal Commissioner, Saharsa.
7. The Forest Divisional Officer, Saharsa, Forest Division, Saharsa.
8. The C.M.D., Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, 4 and 6 Currimbhay Road, Ballard Estate, Mumbai-400001.
9. The Zonal Manager, Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Zonal Office, Asiyana Chamber, 3rd Floor, Exhibition Road, Patna-800001.
10. The District Registrar, Saharsa.
11. The Territory Manager (Retail), Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, Barauni, District- Begusarai.
12. Syed Shamshad Hassain @ Guddu, Son of Late Md. Hasnain, Proprietor of Guddu Nazmi Petrol Pump, Bariyahi Road, Near Tola, Police Station and District- Saharsa.
13. Tarrannum, W/o Syed Shamshad Hassain @ Guddu, The allottee of Proprietor of Guddu Nazmi Petrol Pump, Bariyahi Road, Near Tola, Police Station and District- Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                               |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Adv. |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Standing Counsel (05)     |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Kumar Manish, Adv.        |
|                      |   | Mr. Arun Kumar Prasad, Adv.   |
| For the BPCL         | : | Mr. Rajeev Prakash, Adv.      |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      17-02-2026                      A perusal of the pleading made in the present writ  
  
petition reveals that the petitioner is neither an aggrieved party



nor he is one of the applicants who has applied for the RO Dealership. The petitioner appears to a busybody who is seeking cancellation of the license issued in favour of the private respondents herein. The present writ petition in its present form seeking a writ of mandamus cannot be entertained. In case the petitioner is espousing any public cause then he has to file a Public Interest Litigation (PIL).

2. Having regard to the same, the present writ petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to file a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) if he is so advised.

**(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)**

Gauravkr/-

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

