

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3625 of 2024

=====

Ramesh Kumar Singh S/o Late Staynarayan Singh, R/o Village Ambakhurd,
P.S. Suppi, Distt. Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Pollution Department,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
3. The S.D.O. Sitamarhi Sadar, Sitamarhi.
4. The District Pollution Officer, Sitamarhi.
5. The Circle Officer, Anchal Suppi, Dist. Sitamarhi.
6. Sanjay Singh, S/o Ram Kailash Singh, R/o Village Narkatiya, P.S. Suppi,
Distt. Sitamarhi.
7. The Chairman, Bihar State Pollution Control Board, Bihar.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sitaram Yadav, G.P.-16 Mr. Yatindra Narayan, A.C. to G.P.-16
For Respondent No.6	:	Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate Ms. Shristi Kumari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

8 04-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the State and learned counsel for the respondent

no.6.

2. This writ petition has been filed for a

direction upon the respondent authorities to take immediate

action against the respondent no.6, who is running his brick-kiln

in the name and style of Bajrang Bricks Industries situated at



village- Ramna Amba, P.S.- Suppi, District- Sitamarhi, illegally violating the Pollution Rules.

3. It has been submitted by the petitioner that multiple representations were filed before the respondent authorities to remove the aforesaid brick-kiln.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of respondent no.6 that the petitioner has no *locus* to file the present petition since the petitioner is a resident of village- Amba Khurd whereas, the brick-kiln of respondent no.6, which is running since 2009, is situated at village- Ramna Amba and is far away from the village and the school. The respondent no.6 is operating the aforesaid brick-kiln after obtaining the requisite license issued by the competent authorities and he also possesses the valid certificates.

5. I have considered the submissions of the parties and perused the materials on record. It appears that the present petition is misdirected against the respondent no.6 and the relief sought for cannot be granted under the writ jurisdiction. The petitioner has not challenged the certificates issued in favour of respondent no.6 by the competent authorities. Therefore, the petition appears to be misconceived and has been filed with an oblique intention.



6. In view of the above, this writ petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to avail remedies in accordance with law.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

pawan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

