

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17755 of 2025

Manju Devi Poddar wife of Late Sushil Kumar Poddar, resident of Lal Bazar,
Ward No. 24, near Bhagwati Drugs, Bettiah, P.S- Bettiah, District- West
Champaran (Bettiah).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Collector, West Champaran, Bettiah.
2. The Manager, Bettiah Estate, Bettiah-cum-Additional Collector, West Champaran, at Bettiah.
3. The Revenue Officer, Bettiah Estate, West Champaran, at Bettiah.
4. Indrajeet Yadav son of Late Lakshan Yadav, resident of Village- Balua, Rampuwa, P.S- Bairiya, District- West Champaran.
5. Awadh Yadav son of Late Mohan Yadav, resident of Village- Patarkha, Naurangia, P.S- Bairiya, District- West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sharad Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Manish Kumar, SC-5
	:	Mr. Kumar Pankaj, AC to SC-5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 18-11-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*“(i) for issuance of writ, order or
direction in nature of writ of Certiorari, to quash
the demand notice dated 13.06.2025 asking to
deposit Rs.58,92,752/- (Rupees fifty eight lakhs
ninety two thousand seven hundred and fifty two
only) within one week otherwise, the action will
be taken according to law.*



(ii) for issuance of an appropriate writ/s, order/s direction/s in the nature of writ of Mandamus, directing and commanding the respondent authorities to restore the possession of the petitioner over the House/Sahan which was acquired by way of agreement dated 09.10.2002 between the Manager, Bettiah Estate, West Champaran and husband of the petitioner namely Shri Sushil Kumar Poddar, son of Late Ram Gopal Poddar, resident of Lal Bazar, Bettiah, West Champaran, executed for lease of one unit of Bettiah Estate on monthly rent, situated in Mohalla: Kila, Ward No. 14, near Jora Shivalaya Mandir, area 0.25 (twenty five decimals) and paid the rent for the same by the petitioner/her husband.

(iii) to declare the illegal occupation of the private respondents over the aforesaid petitioner's leased Makan-cum-Sahan, because the private respondents, who are the muscle man and forcibly occupied the said house/land by creating fake and fraudulent documents.



(iv) for issuance of an appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the respondents authorities to declare the any documents favouring the private respondents are void, illegal and fraudulent one, which is not binding upon the petitioner.

(v) for any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner is found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. At the outset, learned State counsel submits that a notice has been challenged by the petitioner in this case. He is well advised to reply to the said notice. The further submission is that lease stands cancelled which has not even been challenged in the year 2002.

4. This Court is in conformity with the submission put forward by the learned State counsel. A simple notice has been issued to the petitioner on 13.06.2025. The petitioner ought to have answered to the said notice, if she has any case instead, the lady has rushed to the Court.

5. Allowing the petitioner to agitate the matter and answer the notice dated 13.06.2025, the writ petition is disposed of.



6. Needless to add, if the petitioner answers to the said notice, the same has to be taken into consideration after hearing all the parties, it will be taken to its logical conclusion at an earliest.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

