

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14022 of 2021

=====
Jeetendra Kumar Singh, Son of Gaya Singh, Resident of Village - Kuarpur,
Ramgarh, P.S. - Pipra, District - East Champaran, Motihari.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Bihar Information Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Chakia, District- East Champaran, Motihari.
6. The Land Reform Deputy Collector, Chakia, District- East Champaran, Motihari.
7. The Anchaladhikari, Chakia, District- East Champaran, Motihari.

... .. Respondent/s

=====
Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar, Adv..
Mr. Sumit Kumar Gupta, Adv.
For the State : Mr. AC to GA-2

=====
CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-03-2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ application has been filed for
issuance of writ in the nature of *mandamus* for a direction to
respondent No. 3 to consider the application of the petitioner



dated 06.08.2020 as the same has not yet been considered and is still pending for due consideration.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the second appeal preferred by the petitioner under Section 19(3) of the Right to Information Act, 2005 has not yet been disposed of and it is for disposal of such appeal that the petitioner has been compelled to approach this Court.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he is aggrieved by the fact that though the copy of the order-sheet has been given to him, however there was some documents, attested copies of which were also demanded by the petitioner, but the same was not given to him.

5. The learned AC to GA-2 submits that the appeal preferred by the petitioner is still pending before the Bihar State Information Commission (*in short the Commission*) and, therefore, two parallel proceedings cannot proceed ahead at the same time. It has been submitted that the counter affidavit specifies that the appeal filed by the petitioner is still pending before the Commission and the photocopy of the file of Settlement Case No. 08/2005-2006 has also been brought on record with the counter affidavit.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the



parties and taking into account the fact that the second appeal of the petitioner is still pending before the Commission, the continuation of the present application would serve no useful purpose. It is, however, directed that the Commission shall expedite the hearing of the second appeal of the petitioner as early as possible, preferably within a period of three months from today.

7. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the application stands disposed off.

8. Interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	14/03/2026
Transmission Date	N/A

