

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8870 of 2026

-
-
1. Brijmohan Prasad Son of Prasadi Saw, Resident of Hospital Road, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.
 2. Manoj Kumar, Son of Nand Kishor Shaw, Resident of Hospital Road, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.
 3. Kundan Kumar, Son of Rajendra Kumar Gupta, Resident of Hospital Road, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.
 4. Ramchandra Prasad, Son of Prasadi Sao, Resident of Mirzapur Station Road, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.
 5. Ajeet Kumar, Son of Pradeep Saw, Resident of Hospital Road, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.
 6. Ravindra Kumar Gupta, Son of Ram Charan Lal, Resident of Line Par Mirzapur, PS-Nawada Sadar, District-Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Nawada.
2. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Nawada.
3. The BSRDCL through its Deputy General Manager, Nawada, Adarsh City Society, Karna Bela, PS- Nawada Town, Dist.Nawada.
4. The Land Acquisition Officer, Nawada.
5. The Circle Officer, Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Saharsh Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Shankar Kumar Thakur, AC to GP-27
For the BSRDCL	:	Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Adv.
		Mr. Manish Dhari Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANA VIKRAM SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 29-06-2026



Heard Mr. Saharsh Singh, the learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. P.K. Shahi, the learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the BSRDCL (respondent No. 3). The State has been represented by Mr. Shankar Kumar Thakur, the learned AC to GP-27.

2. The petitioners have come with a prayer for restraining the respondent authorities from interfering with their peaceful possession over the land in question without specifying the details of the land, simply giving vague details of the land by stating that the same has been situated on the southern side of the Hospital Road, Nawada. The further submission on behalf of the petitioners is that red marking has been done without issuing any notice to them by the respondent authorities.

3. It has further been prayed on behalf of the petitioners that the respondent authorities may be directed to disclose the authority of law under which they have put red mark over the land in question without issuing any notice, on which, the acquisition proceeding is to take place.

4. Perusal of the writ application reflects that without specifying the details of the land in question, mere averments have been made and no supporting documents have



been annexed thereto, substantiating and buttressing the claim of the petitioners' right, ownership and title over the land in question.

5. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that against the red marking over the petitioners' land, a representation has been filed before the District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Nawada (respondent No. 2) for considering the arbitrary action taken by the respondent authorities and to ameliorate their grievances.

6. Mr. P.K. Shahi, the learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the BSRDCL (respondent No. 3), and Mr. Shankar Kumar Thakur, the learned counsel for the State, have submitted that the writ petition lacks basic foundational facts and, thus, on these very vague grounds and in absence of any specific pleading on record, the same is fit to be dismissed.

7. However, in view of the fair stand taken by the learned counsel for the petitioners that they may be granted liberty to file a fresh representation before the authority concerned, they are directed to file fresh representation before the District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Nawada (respondent No. 2), highlighting their grievances duly supported by



relevant documents, within a period of two weeks from today, who, on receipt of such representation, after verifying all the facts and after having issued notices to all the concerned and having heard all the parties, shall pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law within a further period of three weeks of the receipt of such representation.

8. It is needless to state that if the claim of the petitioners are found to be tenable, necessary sequel order shall also be passed by the concerned respondent/authority within the aforesaid period.

9. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the writ petition stands disposed off.

10. Interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed off accordingly.

(Rana Vikram Singh, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	30.06.2026
Transmission Date	N/A

