

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.772 of 2022

=====

Ranjeet Kumar Ojha Son of Sri Kaushalpati Ojha Resident of Village-
Raghopur, Bihta, P.S.- Bihta, District- Patna (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development,
Government of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Sasaram, Rohtas.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Sasaram, Rohtas.
4. The Circle Officer, Nauhatta Block, Sasaram, Rohtas.
5. The Station House Officer, Chutia Police Station, Nauhatta, Rohtas.
6. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Ojha, Advocate Mr. Govind Lal Pandit, Advocate Mr. Ved Prakash Chandan, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Prasad, AC to AAG-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

7 10-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned AC to AAG-4 for the State

2. The present writ application has been filed seeking

following relief:-

*(i) For issuance of writ in the nature of
mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or
direction to respondents to restore and release the
physical possession of the land to the petitioner or to
make payment of compensation of the some illegally
acquired land and constructed road over the land of
the petitioner in Basarhi Mauza without following
any norms of land acquisition act.*



(ii) For issuance of any other appropriate writ, order or direction for which the petitioner is entitled to.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner happens to be the owner of the land detailed in paragraph '3' of the supplementary counter affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner containing a total area of 556 acres and 96 decimals. It has further been submitted that a road has been constructed over the part of the aforesaid land by the Rural Development Department of Bihar, however, there has been no permission sought from the petitioner prior to making such construction. It has next been submitted that the brother of the petitioner had earlier requested the Circle Officer for a certified copy of any report wherein such construction has been made, however, nothing was provided to the petitioner and without any notice the road has been constructed over the raiyati land of the petitioner.

4. On perusal of the record, this Court finds that there is no representation made to any of the authorities on behalf of the petitioner with regard to his grievances and therefore, in the interest of justice and taking into account the fact that the case of the petitioner is that his raiyati land has been utilized for constructing a road without his permission and no objection, let



the petitioner approach the learned District Magistrate, Sasaram at Rohtas, respondent no.2 with a fresh representation raising all the grievances with regard to the construction of the road over his raiyati land.

5. Learned District Magistrate, Sasaram at Rohtas shall consider his representation along with all the relevant documents submitted on behalf of the petitioner and after getting the spot verification and measurement done in the presence of the parties/authorized persons, shall pass a reasoned and speaking order within three months from the date/receipt/production of the order.

6. The present writ application stands disposed off.

7. It goes without saying that if the District Magistrate, Sasaram at Rohtas, finds that the land of the petitioner has been utilized for the construction of the road without his permission, then a suitable compensation shall be paid to the petitioner in accordance with law.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

manoj/-

U			
---	--	--	--

