

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8363 of 2026

=====

Siyaram Ram Son of Laxmi Ram, Resident of Village Hariharpatti, Ward no 5, PS Pipra, District Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Supaul.
4. The Deputy Collector, Department of Land Reforms, Supaul.
5. The Sub-Divisional Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Supaul.
6. The Circle Officer, Block Pipra, District Supaul.
7. The SHO, Pipra Police Station, District Supaul.
8. Paras Ram, S/o Kaleshwar Ram, Resident of Hariharpatti, PS Pipra, District Supaul.
9. Vinod Ram, s/o Hari Lal Ram, Resident of Hariharpatti, PS Pipra, District Supaul.
10. The S.D.M, Pipra, District Supaul

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prafull Chandra Thakur, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (13)
	:	Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, AC to SC-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 07-07-2026 Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for and is allowed to implead the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Pipra, Supaul, as respondent no.10 in course of the day.

2. Heard the parties.

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

“for issuance of a writ preferably in the



nature of Mandamus, commanding and directing to the respondent to remove the encroachment land of the petitioner after measurement where by and where under the land appertaining in Mauza Makroy, Thana no.244, Khata 118, Khesara 42 and Area 5 Decimal has been obtained by the petitioner through the sale deed and/or any other relief/reliefs order/orders for which the petitioner is found to be entitled to in the fact and circumstances of the case.”

4. The details of the land stands incorporated in paragraph no.4 of the petition and read as under:

“Mauza-Makroy, Thana No.244, Tauzi No. 533, Khata No. 118 (old), 102 (new) and Khesara No. 462 (old), 1170 (new).”

5. The petitioner is fighting the battle with respondent no.8 and 9, who according to the petitioner has usurped the land and constructing house on it. He tried to move before the each and every respondent without any success, as a result, the writ petition.

6. Learned State counsel submits that that the petitioner should have move before the Sub-Divisional



Magistrate, Pipra, Supaul who has not even made party respondent in the present case.

7. He further submits that in such dispute between the private parties, the better course of action is to approach the competent Civil Court.

8. Having heard the parties, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner has a forum before the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Pipra, Supaul and/or the concerned Sub-Divisional Magistrate and if such petition under section 163 of the BNSS, the concerned respondent is duty bound to take the matter to its logical conclusion after hearing all the necessary parties.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

