

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3223 of 2026

=====

Ravi Kumar Son of Ram Kumar, R/o Nakta Diyara, Dinpur-cum-Khagaul,
P.S. Digha, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Saharsa.
4. The Mineral Development Officer, District Mining Office, Saharsa.
5. The Mining Inspector, District Mining Office, Saharsa.
6. The Officer-in-Charge, Kathnagar Police Station, Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajnikant, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (11)
For the Mines Dept.	:	Mr. Naresh Dikshit, Spl. PP Mines

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*“(i) for issuance of a writ in the nature
of "Mandamus" for quashing the letter no.
Camp/02/Kathnagar Thana/Khanan, Saharsa
dated 09.01.2026 issued by the Mining Inspector,
District Mining Office, Saharsa whereby and
whereunder the petitioner's truck bearing
Registration No. JH02AH5626 which has been*



illegally seized despite having a valid challan, without issuance of any notice and without granting any opportunity of hearing.

(ii) for issuance of a writ or any other order or direction commanding the respondent authorities to release the truck of the petitioner bearing Registration No. JH02AH5626 which was seized in gross violation of due process of law.

(iii) for direction to the respondent authorities to pay compensation to the petitioner for illegal confinement of his commercial vehicle.

(iv) for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner be found entitled in the eye of law.”

3. A counter affidavit has come on behalf of the respondent nos. 3 to 5 and learned Spl. PP Mines has taken this Court to the paragraph no.6 to show that petitioner ought to have move before the Collector of the district pursuant to the order in question.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an



appropriate appeal shall be filed but there has been delay as the petitioner was pursuing remedy before this Court.

5. If the petition is preferred in next four weeks, the concerned Collector, Saharsa shall take note of the fact that the writ petition was pending before this Court while dealing with the limitation petition.

6. Needless to add, the petitioner will have an opportunity to bring on record every facts/documents before the appellate authority for an appropriate order.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

