

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4034 of 2021

1. RANJIT KUMAR YADAV S/o Lalan Ray
2. Chandraket Kumar Rai S/o Rajendra Rai
3. Vivek Kumar S/o Suraj Nandan Rai
4. Shiv Nath rai S/o Ramakant Rai
5. Harendra Rai S/o Late Rambriksha Rai
6. Lalan Rai S/o Late Rambriksha Rai
7. Deepak Kumar Ray S/o Sri ram Sagar Ray
All residents of village- Chakoli, P.s.- Mahua, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Land Reforms and Revenue Department, Old Secretariat, Patna
2. The District Collector, Vaishali
3. The Superintendent of Police, Vaishali at Hajipur
4. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Mahua
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Mahua
6. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Mahua
7. The Inspector of Police, Mahua, Vaishali
8. The Circle Officer, Mahua
9. The Station House Officer, Mahua, Vaishali

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Shankar Das, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar, AC to Ag

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)

(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted through Video Conferencing and the Advocates joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing from their residence.)

Date : 05-07-2021

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioners have prayed for the following relief(s):-



A) A writ in the nature of mandamus or any appropriate writ/s, order/s, direction/s commanding the respondents for the following reliefs:

i. To direct the respondents to remove the encroachment from the road, where the anti social elements starting construction of Hanuman temple just upon the road so that the road became narrow and the people of the locality facing trouble in coming and going passing through the road. This is the common phenomena in Bihar, where the anti social elements grabbing the land of the Govt. /Private being a musclemen and just erecting Hanuman Temple upon the road as such encroachment made therein upon the road may be removed forthwith. The public at large of the said village filed earlier several complaints to the respondents authorities for removing the encroachment from the road by making prayer to get measure the plot and if it is found that the road has been encroached, in that situation it should be removed immediately, but the authorities concerned sitting tight over the matter and not taking any action to this effect so that under the garb of P.I.L. the petitioners are approaching to this Hon'ble Court to interfere and to protect the right of the citizens to ensure that they are not deprived from said road rightfully.

ii. To direct the respondents to take action against the persons who are grabbing or blocking the road just by erecting Hanuman temple upon the road, Just with a view to harassed the public due to which the road became narrow path. It is well within the powers vested to the Collector, to identify the boundary for the purpose of maintaining revenue records and to protect the Govt. property from encroachment. It is vested power in the Collector to maintain peace, prevention of encroachment by protecting the right of citizens. It the authority employed in the area for measurement, demarcation of the lands so that the public and private land may be protected.

iii) To provide adequate facility/protection to the petitioners which are in danger at the hands of anti social elements.

B. Any other relief or reliefs as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioners, under instructions, states that petitioners shall be content if a direction is issued to the authority concerned to consider and decide the representation which the petitioners shall be filing within a period of four



weeks from today for redressal of the grievance(s).

Learned counsel for the respondents states that if such a representation is filed by the petitioners, the authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order.

Statement accepted and taken on record.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***D. N. Jeevaraj Vs. Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2 SCC 653***, paragraphs 34 to 38 observed as under:-

“34. The learned counsel for the parties addressed us on the question of the bona fides of Nagalaxmi Bai in filing a public interest litigation. We leave this question open and do not express any opinion on the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the High Court in this regard.

35. However, we note that generally speaking, procedural technicalities ought to take a back seat in public interest litigation. This Court held in *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.* [*Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.*, 1989 Supp (1) SCC 504] to this effect as follows: (SCC p. 515, para 16)

“16. The writ petitions before us are not inter parties disputes and have been raised by way of public interest litigation and the controversy before the court is as to whether for social safety and for creating a hazardless environment for the people to live in, mining in the area should be permitted or stopped. We may not be taken to have said that for public interest litigations, procedural laws do not apply. At the same time it has to be remembered that every technicality in the procedural law is not available as a defence when a matter of grave public importance is for consideration before the court.”

36. A considerable amount has been said about public interest litigation in *R&M Trust [R&M Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group, (2005) 3 SCC 91]* and it is not necessary for us to dwell any further on this except to say that in issues pertaining to good governance, the courts ought to be somewhat



more liberal in entertaining public interest litigation. However, in matters that may not be of moment or a litigation essentially directed against one organisation or individual (such as the present litigation which was directed only against Sadananda Gowda and later Jeevaraj was impleaded) ought not to be entertained or should be rarely entertained. Other remedies are also available to public spirited litigants and they should be encouraged to avail of such remedies.

37. In such cases, that might not strictly fall in the category of public interest litigation and for which other remedies are available, insofar as the issuance of a writ of mandamus is concerned, this Court held in *Union of India v. S.B. Vohra* [*Union of India v. S.B. Vohra*, (2004) 2 SCC 150: 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] that: (SCC p. 160, paras 12-13)

“12. Mandamus literally means a command. The essence of mandamus in England was that it was a royal command issued by the King's Bench (now Queen's Bench) directing performance of a public legal duty.

13. A writ of mandamus is issued in favour of a person who establishes a legal right in himself. A writ of mandamus is issued against a person who has a legal duty to perform but has failed and/or neglected to do so. Such a legal duty emanates from either in discharge of a public duty or by operation of law. The writ of mandamus is of a most extensive remedial nature. The object of mandamus is to prevent disorder from a failure of justice and is required to be granted in all cases where law has established no specific remedy and whether justice despite demanded has not been granted.”

38. A salutary principle or a well-recognised rule that needs to be kept in mind before issuing a writ of mandamus was stated in *Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India* [*Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India*, (1974) 2 SCC 630] in the following words: (SCC pp. 641-42, paras 24-25)

“24. ... The powers of the High Court under Article 226 are not strictly confined to the limits to which proceedings for prerogative writs are subject in English practice. Nevertheless, the well-recognised rule that no writ or order in the nature of a mandamus would issue when there is no failure to perform a mandatory duty applies in this country as well. Even in cases of alleged breaches of mandatory duties, the salutary general rule, which is subject to certain exceptions, applied by us, as it is in England, when a writ of mandamus is asked for, could be stated as we find it set out in *Halsbury's Laws of England* (3rd Edn.), Vol. 11, p.



106:

‘198. Demand for performance must precede application.—As a general rule the order will not be granted unless the party complained of has known what it was he was required to do, so that he had the means of considering whether or not he should comply, and it must be shown by evidence that there was a distinct demand of that which the party seeking the mandamus desires to enforce, and that that demand was met by a refusal.’

25. In the cases before us there was no such demand or refusal. Thus, no ground whatsoever is shown here for the issue of any writ, order, or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution.”

As such, petition stands disposed of in the following terms:-

(a) Petitioners shall approach the authority concerned within a period of four weeks from today by filing a representation for redressal of the grievance(s);

(b) The authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously by a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of three months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) Needless to add, while considering such representation, principles of natural justice shall be followed and due opportunity of hearing afforded to the parties;

(d) Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;



(e) We are hopeful that as and when petitioners take recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law, before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch;

(f) Liberty reserved to the petitioners to approach the Court, if the need so rises subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

(g) We have not expressed any opinion on merits. All issues are left open;

(h) The proceedings, during the time of current Pandemic- Covid-19 shall be conducted through digital mode, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to meet in person i.e. physical mode;

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.
Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

Sanjay/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	06.07.2021
Transmission Date	NA

