

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20903 of 2018

Mathura Singh son of Late Ram Gagina Singh, Resident of Village- Mani,
P.S. - Vikramganj, Distt. - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Additional Collector Public Grievance Redressal - Cum- First appellate Authority, Rohtas.
4. The Sub - Divisional, Public Grievance Redressal Authority, Vikramganj, Rohtas.
5. The block Development officer, Vikramganj, Rohtas.
6. The Circle officer, Vikramganj, Rohtas.
7. The Mukhiya, Mani Panchayat, Vikramganj, Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Pathak, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Birendra Prasad Singh, AC to SC-19

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 14-10-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been preferred for the following relief(s):-

(i) For removal of illegal encroachment made arbitrary by the respondent authorities over the total area of 4 decimal land appertaining to Mani Thana No.557, Khata No.412, Plot No.2548 of the exclusive Khatiyani land of the petitioner by way of construction of P.C.C. road under the B.R.G.F. scheme at Mani Panchayat.

(ii) For suitable compensation to the petitioner who suffered mental agony, physical harassment and as irreparable



loss due to unreasonable and arbitrary act of the respondent authorities.

(iii) For any other relief/reliefs as your Lordships may deem fit and proper under the existing facts and circumstances of the case.

3. The matter relates to Thana No. 557, Khata No. 412, Plot No. 2548 under Mani Panchayat in the district of Bikramganj, Rohtas. The petitioner claims himself to be the absolute owner of the said land and the grievance is that without his permission/compensation, under MANREGA Scheme, a road has been constructed by the respondent no. 7, the Mukhiya of the said Mani Panchayat, Bikramganj, Rohtas.

4. He has taken this Court to Annexure-2 to show that upon petitioning the Sub-Divisional Officer, Bikramganj, Rohtas on 25.02.2014, he asked the 'Mukhiya' to immediately stop the construction recording that no government money should be used for a private land. The submission is that still he want ahead.

5. As usual, despite the filing of the writ petition in the year 2018, there is no reply from the respondents.

6. Keeping the case pending for months allowing the respondents to file affidavit after imposing cost is one option. The second option is to direct the Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram



(respondent no. 1) to look into the matter, issue notice to the necessary respondents including the 'Mukhiya' of the Mani Panchayat, Bikramganj, Rohtas and take the matter to its logical conclusion by a reasoned order.

7. Needless to add, if the Collector Rohtas at Sasaram comes to a conclusion that indeed, the land of the petitioner has been used without his permission for the construction of the road, he/she shall be duty bound to take appropriate steps in accordance with law for compensating the petitioner, if he denies permission to voluntarily donate the said land.

8. The entire process has to be completed by 31st March, 2026.

9. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Raj Ranjan/-

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

