**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**
**W.P.(PIL) No. 1820 of 2023**

Bhagwan Prasad Sahu, aged about 44 years, S/o Kadu Lal Sahu, resident of at House No.88, Bhatua, P.O. Baidhmara, P.S. Harla, Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro (Jharkhand)

... ... ... **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Steel, Government of India, having its office at R. No.192, Uduog Bhawan, Rafi Marg, P.O. & P.S. Udyog Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Industries, Government of Jharkhand, First Floor, Nepal House, Doranda, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro, P.O. & P.S. Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro, Jharkhand.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Bokaro, P.O. & P.S. Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro Jharkhand.
6. The Director In-charge, SAIL, Bokaro Steel Plant, Ispat Bhawan Bokaro Steel City, P.O. & P.S. Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro, Jharkhand.
7. The Chief General Manager (Security), SAIL, Bokaro Steel Plant, Ispat Bhawan, Bokaro Steel City, P.O. & P.S. Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro, Jharkhand.
8. The Chief General Manager (Township), SAIL, Bokaro Steel Plant, Ispat Bhawan, Bokaro Steel City, P.O. & P.S. Bokaro Steel City, District Bokaro, Jharkhand.

**… … ... Respondents**

---

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ PRASAD**

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Manoj Kumar Choubey, Advocate

For the Respondent Nos.1 to 5 : Mr. Ashwini Bhushan, AC to Sr.SC-II

For the Respondent Nos.6 to 8 : Mr. Ankit Vishal, Advocate

---

**03/ Dated: 01.10.2026**

**1.** Heard Mr Manoj Kumar Choubey for the petitioner, Mr Ashwini Bhushan, A.C. to Sr. S.C.-II for respondent Nos. 1 to 5, and Mr Ankit Vishal for respondent Nos. 6 to 8.

**2.** The petitioner, who is a practising Advocate, in purported Public Interest, has sought a mandamus commanding the respondents *"to remove the encroachment from SAIL, BSL Township and Government land of different areas in the city of Bokaro."*

**3.** The petitioner has further sought an appropriate writ for compliance of the order passed by the State Officer, BSL, Bokaro vide Case No. A/E/51/2012 for removal of unauthorised constructions of about 4000 Kuchha/pucca houses and khatals spread over 500 acres of land belonging to SAIL, Bokaro Steel Plant.

**4.** Mr. Choubey referred to certain orders made by this Court in W.P.(PIL) No.1076 of 2011 on the very same issue which is now sought to be raised in this petition. He also referred to the order of the State Officer at Annexure-4 (Page-52 of the paper book), the implementation of which is sought by instituting this petition. He also referred to information he obtained under the Right to Information Act (RTI). He pointed out that according to the information supplied, about 271 cases were pending against the encroachers and about

1292 proceedings were pending against those overstaying in the quarters allotted by BSL.

**5.** Mr Choubey also referred to the affidavit filed on behalf of the 5th respondent, in which the 5th respondent stated that the State Officer's order was never communicated to him to secure compliance. He also referred to certain other paragraphs of the 5th respondent's affidavit to submit that there was no co-ordination between the BSL authorities and the State authorities. He submitted that because of this lack of coordination, no effective action was being taken against the encroachers and others overstaying in the quarters allotted by BSL.

**6.** Mr Ankit Vishal submitted that the BSL initiated and is pursuing action in accordance with law. He pointed out that though eviction orders have been passed in many cases, the BSL requires the assistance of the State machinery, including the police authorities, for implementation. He submitted that the BSL has approached the authorities and is pursuing the matters.

**7.** We have considered the rival contentions, perused the averments in the petition and its enclosures.

**8.** At this stage, even if we proceed on the premise that this is indeed a genuine Public Interest Litigation filed by an advocate from the area, we are still satisfied that action is being initiated by the respondents, and this is not a case of complete inaction as is sought to be portrayed by the petitioner.

**9.** The pleadings in the petition are quite sketchy. Any precipitative orders made on such sketchy pleadings, and without even impleading the alleged encroachers as parties, would be a little hazardous.

**10.** The records show that action is being initiated and, in some cases, eviction orders have also been passed. The BSL is expected to secure the execution of such orders, and the State administration is also expected to assist the BSL in such execution. However, this is always subject to any interim or final orders that the alleged encroachers or the persons allegedly overstaying in the BSL quarters may have obtained from the competent Court of law or competent appellate authorities.

**11.** Issuing of general directions based upon the sketchy pleadings would, as noted above, be quite hazardous, particularly in the absence of the parties who are likely to be affected the most if such general directions are issued.

**12.** We cannot accept the petitioner's contention about non-compliance with our previous orders. The orders were made almost 10-15 years ago, and no person, either in the Public Interest or otherwise, has bothered to file any proceedings complaining about such non-compliance.

**13.** From the material produced by the petitioner itself, it cannot be said that the authorities are unaware of the situation or have been completely dormant.

**14.** The purpose of a Public Interest Litigation is to activate the authorities to act in accordance with law against the alleged encroachments pointed out. The authorities also do not deny that there are encroachments or there are cases of employees overstaying in their allotted quarters. However, they also point out that they have initiated action and are continuing it. The record also shows that action has been taken and the process is being pursued.

**15.** In the above circumstances, we are satisfied that no further orders are necessary in this matter.

**16.** We therefore dispose of this petition without any order as to costs.

**(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)**

**(Manoj Prasad, J.)**

October 1st, 2026
BS/Madhav/-
Uploaded on: 07 / 10 /2026