

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6622 of 2020

Md. Eqbal Alam @ Md. Eqbal Alam, Son of Salauddin, Residing at Faridampur, P.S. Sanhola District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Dept., Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate- Bhagalpur, District - Bhagalpur.
4. The Additional Collector, Bhagalpur, District - Bhagalpur.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Kahalgaon, District - Bhagalpur.
6. The Land Reform Deputy Collector, Kahalgaon, District - Bhagalpur.
7. The Anchaladhikari, Sanhola, District - Bhagalpur.
8. Sri Manoj Sah, Residing at Faridampur, P.S.- Sanhola, District - Bhagalpur.
9. Raju Sah, Residing at Faridampur, P.S.- Sanhola, District - Bhagalpur.
10. Dharmendra Sah, Residing at Faridampur, P.S.- Sanhola, District - Bhagalpur.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhananjay Kumar Gupta, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Rishi Raj Sinha, SC-19

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 29-11-2021

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for “issuance of writ nature of mandamus for direction of the respondent removed the encroachment which has been forcibly encroached the land of the petitioner bearing Mouza-Sanhola, Thana No.435, Anchal-Sanhola, District-Bhagalpur bearing Khata No.411, Khesra No.777, Area 20 decimal which is Khatiyani land of the petitioner



same has been forcibly encroached by the Respondents No.8 to 10 when ever no title and further issue direction to the respondent the consider application filed by the petitioner before the Respondent for removing the illegal encroachment of the land of the petitioner and further give other legal consequential benefit of the petitioner”.

3. Having heard the parties and from the averments made in the writ petition, it appears that the land of the petitioner has been encroached by private persons. This is not disputed by the petitioner, nor has he shown that he is aggrieved by any illegal action of the State.

4. In the above circumstances, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter in its extraordinary writ jurisdiction.

5. The writ petition stands dismissed.

6. Needless to say, the petitioner is always at liberty to seek remedy before any forum as may be available to him in accordance with law.

(Vikash Jain, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

AFR/NAFR	N.A.F.R.
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	03.12.2021
Transmission Date	N.A.

