IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(C) No. 8253 of 2026

1. Basanti Mahto
2. Sudhir Mahto
3. Pela Manjhi
4. Folar Chandra Murmu
5. Smt. Jhuni Devi
6. Smt. Kunu Devi
7. Smt. Sukurmani Devi
8. Pedku Manjhi
9. Ajit Prasad Mahto
10. Smt. Radhika Mahato
11. Gobardhan Mahato
12. Laxmi Kanata Mahto
13. Vivek Chandra Mahto
14. Rudna Devi
15. Dashmi Devi
16. Smt. Basanti Mahato
17. Trilochan Mahato
18. Aarti Mahato
19. Indrajeet Mahato
20. Sitaram Singh
21. Arvind Singh
22. Siril Rai
23. Nikhil Singh
24. Basudev Singh Rai
25. Jagannath Singh
26. Bhakti Mahato ….. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through the Secretary, Water Resource Department, Ranchi
2. The Commissioner, Kolhan Division, Chaibasa, West Singhbhum
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Seraikella-Kharsawan
4. The Special Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation Officer No.3, Swarnrekha Project, Chandil, Adityapur, Seraikella-Kharsawan ….. Respondents

---

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioners: Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondents: Mr. Vibhor Mayank, A.C to A.G

05/18.11.2026 The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of direction upon the concerned respondents to pay compensation/damages for acquisition of the houses/wells/ponds etc. to the petitioners as the possession of the same has already been taken by the respondent authorities in the year 1987 itself without payment of compensation/damages to them.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are the displaced persons of Swarnrekha Multipurpose Project, Chandil. Though their houses/wells/ponds etc. were acquired and possession thereof was taken in the year 1987 itself, however, they were not paid compensation/damages towards the same.

3. Leaned counsel for the petitioners, in course of argument, refers to the order dated 21.07.2009 (Annexure-4 to the writ petition) passed by the respondent No.4 and submits that after considering the petitioners' claim for compensation, the said respondent recorded his finding that the petitioners are entitled for compensation, which was assessed @ Rs.39,66,360/-, however, since the said compensation amount exceeded the upper limit of Rs.25 Lac and the same was beyond his jurisdiction, he forwarded the claim to the respondent No.2 for approval. Thereafter, the petitioners kept on visiting the office of the respondent No.4 to inquire about the status of their claim for compensation, but they did not get any positive response in that regard, which compelled them to prefer the present writ petition.

4. Leaned counsel for the petitioners also refers to the order dated 22.10.2018 passed by a Bench of this Court in W.P.(C) No. 5994/2014 and submits that since the case of the petitioners is similarly situated to that of the petitioners of the said writ petition, similar order may be passed in this case.

5. Mr. Vibhor Mayank, learned A.C to A.G appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the petitioners' claim is required to be examined by a competent authority. Hence, if the petitioners prefer a fresh representation in this regard before the respondent No.4, an appropriate decision will be taken in accordance with law within a time frame.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the nature of the prayer made in the present writ petition as well as the order dated 22.10.2018 passed by a Bench of this Court, the petitioners are given liberty to

prefer a fresh representation in this regard before the respondent No.4. On receipt of the said representation, the respondent No.4, after examining the relevant records and on providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners/their representatives, shall take an appropriate informed decision in accordance with law within three months from the date of filing of the said representation.

7. The present writ petition is accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid liberty and direction.

Satish/- (RAJESH SHANKAR, J)