

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8827 of 2021

1. Ishwarchand Prasad son of Late Mahaveer Prasad resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
2. Ramchandra Sah son of Late Chhatu Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
3. Raju Kumar son of Pannalal Prasad, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
4. Lakshmi Sah son of Late Nathuni Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
5. Fida Ansari son of Dukhi Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
6. Umesh Sah son of Late Nathuni Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
7. Md. Saklein, S/o- Shaukat Ali, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
8. Shah Mahamad Ansari S/o- Late Hawaldar Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
9. Mokhatar Miya S/o- Late Jumarati Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
10. Bagad Miya S/o- Late Maksud Devan, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
11. Vakeel Miya S/o- Late Jumraati Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
12. Mustafa Devan S/o- Late Lateef Devan, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
13. Vaidhnath Paswan S/o- Late Jag Paswan, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
14. Mohan Sah S/o- Late Vishun Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
15. Mojahir Miya S/o- Late Badri Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
16. Lal Bahadur Sah S/o- Late Sahdev Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
17. Ramashray Sah S/o- Late Chhadu Sah resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
18. Raju Ranjan Prasad S/o- Shivnath Prasad, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
19. Majid Miya S/o- Late Sikandar Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
20. Mojdar Miya S/o- Late Badri Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).



21. Abdullah Miya S/o- Ajj Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
22. Junab Miya S/o- Noor Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
23. Abbas Ansari S/o- Mojajhil Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
24. Nadim Miya S/o- Eijajul Devan resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
25. O, Male, Aged About 37 years, S/o Eijajul Devan,
26. Akim Ahmad S/o- Late Hadish Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
27. Shaukat Ali S/o- Late Havaladar Miya, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
28. Satar Miya S/o- Late Sikandar Miya resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).
29. Motilal Prasad S/o- Late Saral Sah, resident of Village- Pirari, P.O.- Pirari, P.S.- Inarwa, District- West Champaran (Bettiah).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Works, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District Collector-cum- Magistrate, West Champaran (Bettiah).
6. The Superintendent of Police, West Champaran (Bettiah).
7. The Deputy Development Commission, West Champaran (Bettiah).
8. The Sub Divisional Officer, Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran (Bettiah).
9. The Circle Officer, Mainatand Circle, West Champaran (Bettiah).
10. The Block Development Officer, Mainatand Block, West Champaran (Bettiah).
11. The Officer-In- Charge, Inarwa Police Station, West Champaran (Bettiah).

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shashi Bhushan Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Yogendra Prasad Sinha, AAG 7

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



CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)

Date : 19-07-2021

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

“(i) For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding upon the respondents to remove encroachment from the Government land which is registered in the Khatiyar as Gair Majuarua land and also the removal of obstruction from the Nala from which Sewage water of village was flowing as due to the obstruction in the same the sewage water is logging on the main road of the village and resident of the village are facing acute problem and the resident is also facing problem to approach school and hospitals due to the water lagging upon the main village road.

(ii) For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding upon the respondents for removal of encroachment from the part of the land bearing plot no. 565 khata no. 2 Mauja-Pirari, thana- 239, Area 5 acre 55 decimal which is in the nature of Gair Majurua land from which discharged water from the Nala is flowing. The power full person the help from musclemain of the village has encroached upon the said land and constructed building and obstructed the flow of Nala by making obstruction in the Nala (drain) water and same is being used by the general public including, villagers since a long time.

(iii) And for issuance of any other relief or relief(s) for which the petitioners are entitled



for.”

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)

veena/rajiv-

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

