

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13067 of 2023**

Sahdeo Kumar Yadav alias Sahdeo Yadav Son of Sardanand Yadav, Resident of Dhobi Tola, Kagji Mohalla, Danapur Cantonment, P.S.-Danapur, Dist-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar. Through the D.G.P. Bihar Patna.
2. The Collector, Patna.
3. The Sr. Superintendant of Police Patna.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Danapur, Patna.
5. The Circle Officer, Danapur, Patna.
6. The Thana-in-charge, Danapur Police Station, Danapur, Patna.
7. The Union of India through the Secretary, Defence, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
8. The Director in Chief, Defence Property, Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
9. The Cantonment Board, Danapur Cantonment, through the Chief Executive Officer, Danapur P.S. Danapur, Dist- Patna.
10. The Chief Executive Officer, Danapur Cantonment, Danapur P.S. Danapur, Dist- Patna.
11. Vishnu Kumar Jain Son of late Kashi Nath Jain, Resident of Dhobi Tola, Kagji Mohalla, Danapur, P.S.- Danapur, Dist- Patna.
12. Anil Kumar Jain Son of late Kashi Nath Jain, Resident of Dhobi Tola, Kagji Mohalla, Danapur, P.S.- Danapur, Dist- Patna.
13. Pradeep Kumar Son of not known Resident of Dhobi Tola, Kagji Mohalla, Danapur Cantonment, P.S.- Danapur, Dist- Patna.
14. Savita Devi Wife of Pradeep Kumar alias Munna Resident of Dhobi Tola, Kagji Mohalla, Danapur Cantonment, P.S.- Danapur, Dist- Patna.
15. The Principal Director, Defence Estate, Central Command, 17, Kariyappa Road, Lucknow Cantt, Lucknow (U.P.)

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

|                        |   |                                  |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s   | : | Mr.Sanjay Kumar Ghosarvey        |
| For the Respondent/s   | : | Mr. M. Nasrul Huda Khan ( Sc 1 ) |
| For the Union of India | : | Mr. Anshuman Singh, Advocate     |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      09-01-2024

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.



2. The present application has been filed for commanding the respondent no. 07 to 10 for removal of the unauthorized construction made by the private respondent nos. 13 and 14 by way of encroachment over the land in question.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

4. From the arguments made by the parties, it appears that the petitioner is having same private dispute with the private respondents and he wants to use this Court as a weapon for satisfying his ego. If the petitioner has some grievances, he has alternative remedy of approaching the District Court for the same as he has raised the issue of the invalidity of the sale-deed executed in favour of the private respondents.

5. Accordingly, this application is dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

**(Sandeep Kumar, J)**

Shishir/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

