

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9545 of 2024

=====

Ravindra Prasad Singh Son of Mishri Singh, Resident of Village - Sare, P.S.-
Sare, District - Nalanda, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisonal Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
3. The Collector cum District Magistrate, Nalanda, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Nalanda, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Nalanda, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.
6. The Circle Officer, Asthawan, P.S.- Asthawan, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.
7. The Station House Officer, Police Station - Sare, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.
8. The Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation Division, Nalanda, District - Nalanda at Biharsharif.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Niraj Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. P.K. Shahi, AG

=====

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

Date : 28-06-2024

The Public Interest Litigation is filed to remove encroachment on water bodies situated under Mauza-Sare, Anchal-Asthawan, District-Nalanda and to preserve the same to recharge the ground water level and provide better irrigation facilities.

2. It is also stated that there was a proceeding under the



Bihar Public Land Encroachment Act, 1956, long back in the year 1989–90, and the petitioner also relies on Annexure-P/15 judgment.

3. Annexure-P/15 judgment indicates that after the writ petition was filed on the orders of this Court, steps were taken by the respective Circle Officers to remove the encroachment from the water bodies falling within their respective territorial jurisdiction; which was also appreciated by the Court in its different orders.

4. It was also recorded that considerable steps were taken and efforts were made by the District Magistrate in the removal of encroachment. Directions were also issued to ensure that the work is continued.

5. We do not think a further writ petition is maintainable on the very same contentions. We, hence, dismiss the writ petition.

(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)

(Harish Kumar, J)

aditya/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	01.07.2024.
Transmission Date	

