

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.546 of 2022

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13966 of 2018

=====

Nirbhay Kumar, Son of Dharmpal Ray, Resident of Village - Bishambharpur,
P.O. and P.S. - Bihta, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Md. Balaghuddin, the Secretary, Panchayati Raj, Bihar, Patna.
2. Chandra Shekhar Singh, the District Magistrate, Patna.
3. Vikram Virkar, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Danapur, District - Patna.
4. Kanhaiya Lal, The Circle Officer, Bihta, District - Patna.
5. Vishal Anand, the Block Development Officer, Bihta, District - Patna.
6. Abhinav Dhiman, The Deputy Inspector of Police, Danapur, District - Patna.
7. Ritu Raj Singh the Officer - in - Charge, Bihta Police Station, Bihta, District - Patna.
8. Lal Das Ram, Son of not known, Resident of Village - Bishambharpur, P.O. and P.S. - Bihta, District - Patna.
9. Santosh Kumar, Son of Lal Das Ram, Resident of Village - Bishambharpur, P.O. and P.S. - Bihta, District - Patna.
10. Dayanand Ray, Son of Shukul Ray, Resident of Village - Bishambharpur, P.O. and P.S. - Bihta, District - Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Najeeb Ahmad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party No.8	:	Mr.Amit Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Alok Ranjan, Ac to AG5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. B. BAJANTHRI)

5 01-09-2023 The present MJC is filed for non-compliance of the

order dated 08.12.2020 passed in CWJC No. 13966 of 2018.

2. The subject matter is relating to whether alleged 17

encroachers have encroached the public land or not? In this

regard, the petitioner was asked to submit his representation,



and thereafter, the concerned authority was required to decide the petitioner's grievance within a period of three months.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the process of removal of certain encroachments are completed and petitioner was informed. In fact petitioner has accepted in writing to the extent that certain encroachments have been removed by the respondents. The same is being disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Petitioner's such contention cannot be appreciated when the petitioner has already given his acceptance. If the petitioner still feels that there is non-compliance in respect of grievance stated in his representation, he is at liberty to file a fresh petition insofar as questioning the order dated 29.08.2023.

4. Accordingly, the present MJC stands dropped.

(P. B. Bajanthri, J)

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

abhishekk/-

U			
---	--	--	--

