

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1225 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-0 Thana- District- Nalanda

=====

Kameshwar Prasad, Son Of Late Tota Mahto, Resident Of Village + P.O.-
Raitar, P.S.- Giriyak, District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Nalanda, Biharsharif
3. The Superintendent of Police, Nalanda, Biharsharif
4. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rajgir, District- Nalanda.
5. The Station House Officer, Giriyak Police Station, District- Nalanda.
6. Karu Yadav Son of Late Baldev Yadav Resident of Village- Guljarbigha,
P.S.- Giriyak, District- Nalanda.
7. Saryug Yadav Son of Late Baldev Yadav Resident of Village- Guljarbigha,
P.S.- Giriyak, District- Nalanda.
8. Musfafir Yadav Son of Late Baldev Yadav Resident of Village- Guljarbigha,
P.S.- Giriyak, District- Nalanda.
9. Damodar Sao Son of Late Bisheshwar Sao Resident of Village- Tarokhar,
P.S.- Giriyak, District- Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate Mr. Venkatesh Kaushik, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, AC to GP-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

6 16-09-2025 The present petition has been preferred for direction
to the Respondent-Police Authorities to provide security to the
petitioner.

2. As per the averment made in the writ petition, there
is dispute between the petitioner and Respondent No. 9 in
regard to 24 decimal of land bearing Khata No. 128, Plot No.
564, situated in Mauza Tarokhar, Police Station, Giriyak,



District – Nalanda and there are series of litigations between them before the Revenue Courts. Respondent No. 9 is trying to dispossess the petitioner forcibly from the land in question and even a proceeding under Section 107 Cr.PC was initiated and dropped.

3. As per further averment made in the writ petition, the private respondents are muscle men and criminal minded and the petitioner has apprehension of threat from them.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.C. to G.P.-4.

5. Apparently, the present writ petition is misconceived. There is land dispute between the parties and the petitioner has apprehension of forcible dispossession from the land and even threat from the private respondents.

6. In such facts and circumstances, the petitioner has remedy to file Suit for declaration of Title and permanent injunction against the private respondents and if he has any threat from any of the private respondents, he can engage his private guards, because State cannot provide police security to each and every citizen of the State.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable.



8. However, the petitioner is at liberty to take legal steps, as advised.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

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

