

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BANGLADESH
HIGH COURT DIVISION
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

Writ Petition No. 13324 of 2018.

In the matter of:

An application under article 102 (2) of the
Constitution of the People's Republic of
Bangladesh.

-And-

In the matter of:

Begum Nadira Sultana.

..... Petitioner

-Versus-

The Government of Bangladesh represented
by the Secretary, Ministry of
Communication and Railway and others.

. . respondents.

Mr. Md. Ali Haider, Advocate

. . . For the petitioner.

Mr. Md. Aktaruzzaman, Advocate

. . . For the respondent No.2.

Present:

Mr. Justice J. B. M. Hassan

and

Mr. Justice Razik Al Jalil

Heard and Judgment on 03.07.2024.

J. B. M. Hassan, J.

The petitioner obtained the Rule Nisi calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why the respondents should not be directed to execute and register the sale deed in favour of the petitioner pursuant to open bid conducted by respondent No.3 and handed over possession of the land measuring 19.75 Kathas under Mouza Mohora, near Janali Hut Station (Ispahanis Siding line, Chittagong) of Lot No. KA, Plots No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and BS sheet 6 and 7 B.S. Dag No. 18785 and 18227 under District-Chittagong and/or pass such other or further order or orders as to this Court may seem fit and proper.

Relevant facts involved in the writ petition are that through a competitive bid the petitioner purchased the schedule land from the respondent-railway department and accordingly, made entire payment. But sale deed having not been executed and registered regarding the schedule land, the petitioner filed this writ petition and obtained the present Rule Nisi.

During pendency of the Rule, due to passing different interim orders on the basis of the petitioner applications, eventually the respondent-railway department executed and registered sale deed and today by filing supplementary affidavit learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that possession of schedule land has also handed over in favour of the petitioner.

In the circumstances, both the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the respondents No. 2 and 3 jointly submit that the Rule may be disposed of as the petitioner received possession regarding the schedule land by virtue of the said sale deed.

Regard being had to the above, the Rule is disposed of.

Communicate a copy of this judgment and order to the respondents at once.

Razik Al Jalil, J

I agree.