

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4359 of 2015

=====

Suresh Singh, Son of Sri Amar Singh, Resident of Village : Sripur -
Rampur, P.S. - Sugauli, District : East Champaran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Collector, Motihari, District :
Motihari.
2. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Motihari.
3. The Circle Officer, Sugauli, District : East Champaran at Motihari.
4. The Dy. Collector (Land Reforms) District : East Champaran at
Motihari.
5. Sri Sudama Singh, Son of Mukhlal Singh
6. Sri Lav-Kush Singh, son of Ramashray Singh
7. Sri Alok Singh. Son of Late Prabhu Singh
8. Sri Dilip Singh, Son of Ramashray Singh
Sl.No. 5 to 8 all residents of Village : Sripur Tola Rampur, P.S.
Sugauli, District : East Champaran at Motihari.
9. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinod Gautam, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Md. Anisul Haque, AC to AAG-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

2 05-11-2015 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to
implead the District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari as
respondent no.9 in course of the day.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The grievance of the petitioner is that respondent nos.
5 to 8 have encroached the public land of Khata No.693 which is
“*Gairmazarua Aam*” in nature appertaining to Khesra No.3949 of
Mauza Sripur Rampur, P.S.-Sugauli, District-East Champaran at
Motihari.

It is contended that Encroachment Case No.14/2014 was initiated and final decision has been taken by the Circle Officer finding the aforesaid respondents as encroachers and directing them to remove the encroachment, otherwise, the same would be removed with the help of the district administration, however, no action, thereafter, has been taken.

Accordingly, the District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari (respondent no.9) is directed to look into the matter and, if final order has been passed and that has not been altered or modified in any appeal or any appropriate proceeding, then the matter should be brought to its logical conclusion in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

However, it is made clear that this Court is not formed any opinion in this regard and the action would be dependant upon the nature of order that has been passed finally by the competent authority.

This disposes of the writ petition.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

V.K. Pandey/-

U			
---	--	--	--