

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9197 of 2025

=====

Kaushlendra Kumar Son of Arjun Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-Basniyawar, Police Station-Gokhulpur, District-Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
3. The Circle Officer, Harnaut, District-Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ram Vinay Pd. Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Government Advocate (5)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to GA-5.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, at the outset, submits that the writ petitioner is seeking a writ of mandamus and the basic principle of writ of mandamus is demand and refusal and from perusal of the pleading made in the writ application, it would manifest that the petitioner has rushed to the writ Court without approaching the authorities for seeking redressal of his grievance as raised in the instant writ application. Learned State counsel fairly submits that the instant writ application has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction upon the authorities not to construct Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan over the land in dispute which the petitioner claims to



be a '*Belagan*' land belonging to him. It is next submitted that the petitioner ought to have moved before the District Magistrate, Nalanda seeking redressal of his grievance as raised in the instant writ application, in the event, if the District Magistrate would not have acted on the representation of the petitioner, in that event, the same would have given a cause of action to the petitioner to move before this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the State, the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application. The instant writ application is, accordingly, dismissed.

5. However, the dismissal of the writ application shall not preclude the petitioner from approaching the authority competent for seeking redressal of his grievance in accordance with law as raised in the instant writ petition.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

