

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8845 of 2019

=====

Chandan Kumar Mandal, S/o Late baidya Nath Mandal, Resident of Village-Souriya, P.S. Dankhora, District-Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Animal and Fisheries, New Secretariat, Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary, Department of Fisheries, New Secretariat, Bihar, Patna
3. The Director of Fisheries, Directorate of Fisheries, Bihar, Patna, Officers' Hostel Block-A, Bailey Road, Patna
4. The District Fisheries Officer -cum- Chief Executive Officer, Katihar, District-Katihar.
5. The Circle Officer, Dandkhora, P.S.-Dandkhora, District-Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Kant Choudhary
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sajid Salim Khan, SC-25

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 30-04-2019 Heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned.

This writ application has been filed questioning notice, dated 07.03.2019, issued by the Director, Fisheries, Directorate of Fisheries, Government of Bihar, Patna, whereby the petitioner has been directed to deposit revenue for the Financial Year 2018-19, which has not been deposited against settlement of fish farm.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that though, total area of 12 acres 13 decimals was settled in his favour in the year 2016, but because of



encroachment, the petitioner is availing only 04 acres of land. According to him, he has been representing the authorities raising grievance that he is not in a position to utilise more than 04 acres of area.

My attention has been drawn in this regard to the representation made by the petitioner which is at Annexure 5 of the writ application. The said representation addressed to the District Fisheries Officer -cum- Chief Executive Officer, Katihar, to the extent it relates to encroachment is completely vague. There is no material to suggest that the petitioner ever approached any authority with a grievance that the petitioner was enjoying less area than that was settled to him. Further, except for the said representation, there is nothing on record which can be the basis for the petitioner to take a plea that he ever represented the authorities in this regard.

This application, in my opinion, is frivolous and deserves to be dismissed.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed without costs.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J.)

Ashish/Ragini-

U			
---	--	--	--

