IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 7292 of 2026

Rajesh Ganjhu, S/o Shankar Ganjhu, R/o Village-Sikid Tola Bhuiyandih, PO-Sikid, PS & District-Chatra

... … Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through the Secretary, Department of Forest and Environment, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
2. The Principal Conservator of Forest, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
3. The Divisional Forest Officer, South Forest Division, Chatra
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Chatra
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Chatra
6. The Circle Officer, Chatra … … Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajiv Nandan Prasad, Advocate
Mr. Sushant Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Shivam Kumar, AC to AG

Order No. 03 **Dated: 23.09.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of direction upon the respondent authorities particularly the respondent no. 3 – the Divisional Forest Officer, South Forest Division, Chatra to demarcate the land appertaining to 14 Nos. of Plot under Khata No. 5 measuring an area of 8.44 acres of Village-Sikid, PS & District-Chatra which, according to the petitioner, is the "khatiyani/raiyati" land recorded in his ancestors' name. Further prayer has been made to restrain the forest authorities from interfering with the petitioner's peaceful possession over the said land.

2. The grievance of the petitioner as raised in the present writ petition is that though the aforesaid land is "khatiyani/raiyati" land, the forest officials have been repeatedly interfering with part of the said land which is in his possession. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that if the aforesaid

land is not demarcated vis-à-vis the forest land, the dispute between the petitioner and the forest department is inevitable. He accordingly submits that the respondent no. 3 may be directed to take appropriate steps in this regard.

3. Mr. Shivam Kumar, learned AC to AG appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the aforesaid claim of the petitioner is required to be factually examined by the competent authority i.e., the respondent no.3. Hence, if the petitioner prefers a fresh representation in this regard before the respondent no. 3, an appropriate decision in accordance with law will be taken within a timeframe.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of prayer made in the writ petition, without entering into the petitioner's aforesaid claim, he is given liberty to prefer fresh representation on the present issue before the respondent no. 3. On receipt of the said representation, the respondent no. 3, after making a proper enquiry and on providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner/his representative, shall take an appropriate informed decision in accordance with law within eight weeks from the date of filing of the representation.

5. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with aforesaid liberty and direction.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

September 23, 2026
Manish

Uploaded on 24.09.2026