

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.101 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

Sukhu Prasad, son of Late Munshi Prasad, resident of Village- Gonpura, P.O.-
Naitaul, Police Station- Kadirganj, Masaudhi, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Home Secretary, Home Department,
Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate, Patna, District- Patna.
3. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patna, District- Patna.
4. The Eastern Superintendent of Police Patna, District- Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Masaudhi, District- Patna.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Masaudhi, District- Patna.
7. The Station Head Officer, Kadirganj Police Station, District- Patna.
8. Nagendra Prasad, Son of Grija Nandan Prasad.
9. Mithilesh Prasad, Son of Grija Nandan Prasad.
10. Dharmendra Prasad, Son of Grija Nandan Prasad.
11. Rajesh Kumar, Son of Brij Nandan Prasad.
12. Grija Nandan Prasad. Son of Dineshwar Prasad.
13. Vinod Prasad, Son of Dineshwar Prasad.
14. Brijnandan Prasad, Son of Dineshwar Prasad.
15. Brajesh Kumar, Son of Vinod Prasad.
16. Ramji Prasad, Son of Late Keshwar Prasad
17. Basant Sao, Son of Late Badri Sao, Respondent no. 8 to 17 are resident of
Village- Gonpura, P.O.- Naitaul, Police Station- Kadirganj, Masaudhi,
District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Upendra Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Ghosarvey, AC to AAG-3
For Private Resps.		
Nos 8 to 17	:	Mr. Tripit Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER



3 19-08-2025 The present criminal writ petition has been filed for directing the official respondents to take proper action on the application of the petitioner dated 05.12.2017 in regard to harvesting the paddy crop from his field which is being obstructed by the private respondents.

2. I heard learned counsel for the petitioner on the point of maintainability of the present petition.

3. I find that apparently, not only there is substantive change of the situation which has prompted the petitioner to file the present writ petition, the present writ petition is not maintainable. The petition is misconceived as per law and the petitioner has alternative remedy by approaching the Executive Magistrate to take preventive measures under Cr.PC in regard to paddy crop.

4. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed not only as infructuous, but even as non-maintainable.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

