

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.327 of 2026

=====

Baidyanath Mukhiya Son of Late Badair Mukhiya, Resident of Village-
Kaithwar, P.S.- Sakatpur, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Director Secondary Education, Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Education Officer, Darbhanga.
3. The District Programme Officer, Secondary Education, Darbhanga.
4. The Block Development Officer, Tardih, Darbhanga.
5. The Circle Officer, Tardih, Darbhanga.
6. The Block Education Officer, Tardih, Darbhanga.
7. The Headmaster, Plus 2 Rajoyakrit, Patel High School, Narayanpur, P.S - Sakatpur, District- Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Mahasweta Chatterjee, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vikramadit, AC to SC 22

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 19-01-2026 Heard Ms. Mahasweta Chatterjee, learned counsel

appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Vikramadit,

learned AC to SC 22 for the State.

2.Petitioner has *inter alia* prayed for following reliefs

in the paragraphs No.1 of the writ petition:-

*“(I) That an appropriate writ may be issued
commanding upon the Headmaster, the Respondent No.7
for executing an agreement with the petitioner with regard
to Rajokhar Pokhar, situated within the campus of Rajyakrit
Patel High School, Narayanpur, for the period as decided
by the managing committee of the school immediately
without any delay.*

*(ii) Any other relief/reliefs for which the
petitioners are found entitled to.*

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner submitted that it has been resolved by the school authorities under the chairmanship of the headmaster of the school, namely, Rajyakrit Patel High School, Narayanpur for settlement of Rajokhar Pokhar through open bid and petitioner after the bid, deposited a sum of Rs.16,10,000/-on 30.10.2025 but he has not been given due possession of the pond in question and earlier the said pond was settled with one Devkala Devi.

4. Considering the relief as prayed for the in present writ petition and the fact that the petitioner has already deposited a sum of Rs.16,10,000/- and still petitioner is being restrained by the villagers and some of the interested persons, who are influenced by the Managing Committee of the school, I find it proper to direct the District Magistrate, Darbhanga and Superintendent of Police, Darbhanga to call for the records relating to settlement in respect of the pond from the District Education Officer, Circle Officer and the principal of the school concerned and thereafter give thoughtful consideration of the same, so that the petitioner is not deprived of his right after having deposited the entire amount way back on 30.10.2025. In case, any formalities or any procedural requirement is awaited, the District Magistrate must ensure that the same is carried by the appropriate authority within a period of three weeks from



the date of knowledge of this order. The District Magistrate in garb of the earlier order of this Court which has not been challenged or any order passed by the District Education Officer must not delay in allowing the petitioner the possession of the pond. The Collector must also ensure to issue *Parwana* or direct the competent authority to issue *Parwana*, considering the fact that the pond has been settled in favour of the petitioner after due deliberation of the Managing Committee of the school on 30.10.2025.

5. At this stage, Ms. Mahasweta Chatterjee, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner informs that in the public interest, the settlement period should be fixed for 10 years in place of one year, as it was done in case of Devkala Devi for 5 years, so that Government may not suffer any financial loss. Petitioner is agreed that if the same is allowed, the petitioner will deposit yearly increase at the rate of 25% of the amount which has been settled for the financial year 2025-26 over and above Rs.16,10,000/-.

6. The relief as prayed for by learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner at this stage, cannot be looked into by this Court. However, the authority concerned may consider the same in accordance with the prescribed procedure for every



increase for the period of 10 years, as desired by the petitioner.

7. The writ petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.

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

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

