

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.128 of 2026

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.639 of 2019

=====

Rakesh Ranjan Son of Late Ramshidh Sharma @ Ramsidh Sharma, Resident
of Village Hardashpur, P.O.- Saho Bigha, P.S.- Ghosi, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through its Chief Secretary, Shri Prataya Amrit Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Shri Santosh Kumar Mall, The Principal Secretary, Irrigation Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Shri C.K. Anil, The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Shri Allangkita Pandey, District Magistrate, Jehanabad.
5. Shri Arun Kumar Paswan, The Executive Officer, Irrigation Department, Jehanabad.
6. Shri Sudhir Tiwary, The Circle Officer, Ghosi, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arbind Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Government Advocate 2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 01-05-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) "for initiation of contempt proceeding
against the opposite parties specially the
Circle Officer, Ghosi, Jehanabad for the
violation of the order dated 23.04.2024
passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWJC No.
639 of 2019."*



3. A show cause has come on behalf of the opposite party nos. 04 and 06 and the learned State counsel has taken this Court to paragraph nos. 07 to 12 which read as under:

7. That from the measurement report annexed by the petitioner himself as Annexure-P/4, it is evident that only limited earthwork was found on certain portions of the land, which was carried out by the Irrigation Department.

8. That without prejudice to the above, and taking serious note of the petitioner's claim, fresh verification was directed by the Circle Officer, Chosi vide Letter No. 504 dated 10.04.2026.

9. That pursuant thereto, the Anchal Amin submitted report dated 11.04.2026, which clearly establishes that no further work has been carried out and the earlier position remains unchanged.

10. That it is further submitted that as per official records, the work under



Agreement No. 02/SBD/2018-19 dated 19.04.2018 was sanctioned only up to 7.32 KM chainage, whereas the land claimed by the petitioner situated at 7.57 KM chainage, i.e.. beyond the sanctioned project limit.

11. That the report clearly demonstrates that any earthwork found on the petitioner's land is beyond the approved project alignment and therefore cannot be treated as part of any sanctioned governmental activity. Consequently, such land is not liable to acquisition under the approved scheme.

12. That it is further submitted that the land in question is presently lying unused and there is no ongoing construction activity over the same.

4. Learned State counsel with the help of paragraph-12 submits that the land in question is lying unused and there is no construction activity over it.

5. This Court is satisfied with the show cause filed by



the opposite parties, the MJC No. 128 of 2026 is disposed of
with liberty to the petitioner to agitate the matter, if he so wants.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

