IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1467 of 2017

CNR No. BRHC010491142017

==========

1. Rameshwar Singh and Ors Son of Late Shesh Nath Kushwaha, Resident of Village- Dumdumwa, Police Station- Sathi, District- West Champaran.
2. Janardhan Dubedi, Son of Late Rajendra Dubedi, Resident of Village- Satwaria, Police Station- Sathi, District- West Champaran.
3. Raj Kishore Singh, Son of Late Paras Nath Singh, Resident of Village- Singhpur, Police Station- Sathi, District- West Champaran.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The District Magistrate, Bettiah, District- West Champaran.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Narkatiganj, District- West Champaran.
4. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Narkatiaganj, District- West Champaran.
5. The Circle Officer, Block Lauriya, District- West Champaran.
6. Hardeo Das, Son of Late Ramayan Das.
7. Rajdeo Das, Son of Ramayan Das. null
8. Prabhu Das, Son of Ramayan Das. null
9. Shivmuni Das, Son of Satnarayan Das.
10. Nagendra Das, Son of Deoki Das.
11. Duryodhan Das, Son of Late Lakhu Das.
12. Paras Das, Son of Deoki Das.
13. Harendra Das, Son of Late Bansi Das.
14. Lakhandeo Das, Son of Ramayan Das.
15. Shambhu Das, Son of Late Chhatthu Das, All resident of Village- Dumdumwa, Police Station- Sathi, District- West Champaran.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Kishun Prasad, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Arvind Kumar, GP 19
For the Respondent no. 6-15 : Mr. Ram Adya Singh, Adv.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

7 29-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel appearing on

WEB COPY

behalf of the respondent no. 6 to 15.

2. This writ application has been preferred by the petitioners for appropriate directions to the authorities.

I. For quashing of the proposed settlement made by Respondent-Circle Officer in favour of private Respondents.

II. For removal of encroachment by the private Respondents on public land and disturbing the peaceful possession of petitioners.

III. For any other/relief to which petitioners are found entitled.

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf of Respondent no. 2 to 5, in which in paragraph 7, it has been specifically mentioned that an Encroachment Case No. 39 of 2026-27 has already been initiated against the encroachers of the land, in question, and therefore prayer has been made that the encroachment proceedings should be brought to a logical conclusion.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the Judgment of this court in the case of Asharfi Yadav Vs State of Bihar as reported in 2026 (5) PLJR 211 and has submitted that the encroachment proceedings may be conducted and

WEB COPY

disposed of, in terms of the guidelines which has been laid out in the said case as mentioned from paragraph 28 to 30 of the order.

5. Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the respondent no. 6 to 15 does not dispute this position.

6. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court directs that the Encroachment Case No. 39 of 2026-27 be expeditiously decided after hearing all the parties within the stipulated period of three months.

7. It goes without saying that if encroachment proceedings are not concluded within the stipulated period, liberty shall be given to the petitioner to approach this Court for the reddresal of the grievances.

8. Writ petition stands disposed of in view of the observations made aforesaid.

(Raj Kumar, J)

ashutosh/-

U			

WEB COPY