

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4334 of 2016

- =====
1. Md. Salahuddin Son of Abdul Sakur Mian
 2. Dinesh Kumar son of Sri Nathun Yadav Both Resident of Mohalla-Pachhatti PS Bodhgaya District Gaya.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate,
3. The Circle Officer, Bodhgaya dist Gaya.
4. The Officer-In-Charge, Bodhgaya Police station District Gaya.
5. The Executive Officer, Nagar Panchayat Bodhgaya.
6. Md. Javed@Babloo Miyan son of Md.
7. Md. Jahiruddin son of Late Dukhi Mian
8. Md. Samimuddin @Nanholi Mian son of Md. Jahiruddin Mian
9. Golden son of Nasumuddin
10. Rinku son of Nasim Akhtar , C/o Md. Jahiruddin
11. Safaq Son of Md. Saminuddin
12. Kasuf son of Md. Samunuddin
13. Osama son of Saminuddin 6 to 13 are Resident of Village pachhatti resident of Village Pachhatti P.s Bodhgaya District Gaya.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anjani Kumar, AAG-6
Mr. Deepak Sahay Jamuar, AC to AAG-6
For Respondent No.5: Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 04-04-2016 Heard Mr. Rampravesh Kumar, learned Counsel, appearing on behalf of the petitioners, and Mr. Anjani Kumar, learned Additional Advocate General No.6, appearing on behalf of the State-respondents. Heard also Mr. Ashok Kumar, learned Counsel, appearing on behalf of respondent No.5.

The grievance of the writ petitioner, made in this writ

petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, in the nature of Public Interest Litigation, relates to illegal encroachment allegedly made by respondent Nos.6 to 13 over public land situated at Mohalla Pachhatti, in the district of Gaya.

Having regard to the facts pleaded in this writ petition, the materials on record and, having heard learned counsel for both the parties, we find that the subject-matter of this writ petition is fully covered by the observations made, and the directions given by us in the order, dated 24.11.2015, passed in C.W.J.C.No.4309 of 2015 (**Sanjay Jha Vs. The State of Bihar and Others**), reported in 2016 (1) PLJR 248.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, it is hereby directed that respondent No.2, namely, District Magistrate, Gaya, shall act, in the present matter, in accordance with law, keeping in view the observations made and the directions given in the order, dated 24.11.2015, aforementioned.

In view of the above, this writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

(I.A. Ansari, ACJ)

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J)

Mkr./-

U			
---	--	--	--