

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18726 of 2014

=====

Satya Narayan Singh son of Late Paryag Narayan Singh, resident of village-
Korai, P.S.-Garhpura, district- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Commissioner, Darbhanga range Darbhanga.
3. The District Magistrate, Samastipur
4. The D.C.L.R., Rosera, Samastipur.
5. The Circle officer, Anchal Hasanpur, Samastipur
6. The Junior Engineer, Department of Rural Engineering Organisation,
Rosera, Samastipur.
7. Jawahar Prasad Singh @ Prabhat Kumar Singh, son of Late Janki Prasad
Singh, resident of village- Hasanpur, P.s.- Hasanpur, district- Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Onkar Nath, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Ravi Kumar, AC to GP-13
		Mr. Akshay Lal Prasad, AC to GP-13
For respondent no.7	:	Mr. Pintu Kumar Patel, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

8 01-07-2025 Heard Mr. Onkar Nath, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Ravi Kumar, learned AC to GP-12 beside Mr.

Pintu Kumar Patel, learned counsel for the respondent no7.

2.The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

*(i) for setting aside the order dated 24.07.14
passed by the learned court of Bihar Land
Tribunal, Patna in connection with B.L.T.
case no. 809/13 whereby and whereunder*



the learned court below was pleased to the affirm the order dated 30.01.13 passed by the respondent no.2 in connection with Land Dispute Appeal no. 482/12 which had been preferred by the petitioner against the order dated 07.02.12 passed by the learned court of D.C.L.R. Rosera in Land Dispute Case No. 43/11;

(ii) for waiving of fine for a sum of Rs. 1000/- as imposed by the learned court below;

(iii) grant of any other incidental or consequential relief or reliefs for which the petitioner can be found entitled for.

3. This Court has gone through the order of the Tribunal and do not find any error in it. If the contention of the petitioner is that the road existed on the land in question, the proper forum should have been to approach the State-respondent and if he has any dispute with private respondents, the forum should have been the competent Civil Court. Instead, the writ petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner after some



argument submits that he shall be approaching the Collector, Samastipur alongwith all the relevant documents which he has under his arm. The submission of the learned counsel is that the cost of Rs.1000/- imposed upon him be waived off as he was contesting the matter under the bonafide belief.

5. Learned State counsel has no objection.

6. Taking into account the aforesaid facts, the writ petition is disposed of allowing the petitioner to approach the concerned authority for the redressal of his grievance who shall be taking up the matter and dispose it of expeditiously.

7. It is made clear that this Court has not commented on the merit of the case. The cost of Rs.1000/- imposed by the Tribunal in the particular facts and circumstances stands waived off.

8. The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

