

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8747 of 2026

=====

Brajendra Kumar Singh S/o-Late Shyam Narayan Singh, R/o- Village-
Bastipur, P.S.-Muffassil, District-. Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through the Principal Secretary, Dept. of Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Rohtas (Sasaram).
4. The Additional District Magistrate-cum-Additional Collector, Rohtas (Sasaram).
5. The District Programme Officer, Rohtas (Sasaram).
6. The District Education Officer, Rohtas (Sasaram).
7. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Dehri (Rohtas).
8. The Circle Officer/Anchaladhikari, Anchal- Dehri, Dist.-Rohtas.
9. The Block Education Extension Officer, Block- Dehri, Dist.-Rohtas.
10. The Headmaster, Upgraded Senior Secondary School, Bhainsha, Village-Bastipur, P.S.- Indrapuri, Dist.- Rohtas.
11. The S.H.O., Police Station- Indrapuri, Dist.- Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Onkar Nath, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Standing Counsel (11)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-07-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

*Setting aside the order as
contained in Memo No.-
399/law, dt.-19.03.2026,
purported to have been issued*



by the Resp. No.-7 whereby & whereunder the direction has been issued to do the construction of the School building upon the land for a total area of I Acre 72 Decimal pertaining to Mauza-Katar, Revenue Thana No.-176, Khata No.-231, Khesra No.-812, 813, 826 & 827 for an area of 55, 54, 28 & 35 decimal respectively.

Further commanding the respondent authorities to stop the construction of School building upon the land in question immediately which is admittedly the raiyati land of the petitioner.

For a direction to do the recovery of the amount from those officials who are



responsible for wastage of public money by way of construction of School building without verifying the right/interest to the land in question.

For grant of any other incidental/consequential relief/reliefs, for which the petitioner can be found entitled for.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is an ancestral property of the family but the respondents are showing their high handedness in usurping the land.

4. Learned State Counsel submits that the documents on record by way of Annexure clearly show that the school is existing for 75 years and the order shows that one of the family member of the petitioner (namely Kundan Kumar) also participated in an auction of the school in the year 2022 and in that background, it would be appropriate for him/them to agitate the matter before an appropriate authority/Court.

5. This Court is also of the view that the rent receipt



dates back to the year 1994, there is nothing on record to show why the petitioner failed to agitate the matter three decades ago if at all he/they have a case, as the learned State Counsel rightly pointed out, the appropriate Court is to move before a competent Civil Court.

6. With aforesaid observation, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

ankita/-

U			
---	--	--	--

