IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.7494 of 2026

---

1. Md. Shahnawaz Alam son of Abdul Sattar.
2. Md. Anwar Hussain son of Akhtar Hussain.
3. Ahmad Hussain Ansari, son of Md. Fagu Miyan.
4. Mohammed Mansur Ansari, son of Hikmat Ali.
5. Manbodh Kumar Mandal, son of Balram Mandal.

All are resident of village Bandhdih, P.O. & P.S. Govindpur, District-Dhanbad, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioners.

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad.
3. District Development Officer, Dhanbad.
4. Circle Officer, Govindpur, Dhanbad.
5. Commandant of Police, JAP-3, Govindpur, Department of Police, Govindpur, Dhanbad.

..... Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioners : Mr. Bhaiya Vishwajeet Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Avishek Chandra, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ashish Shekhar, AC to SC (L&C)-II

Order No.03 **Date: 28.09.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction upon respondent no. 2, the Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad, to ensure that the existing pathway from the petitioners' houses should not be obstructed or blocked in the garb of beautification of a pond, namely, 'Rejali Talab'.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are permanent residents of Village-Bandhdih, P.S. Govindpur, District-Dhanbad, and they/their ancestors have been residing in the said village for more than a century. It is further submitted that the concerned pathway is a public village road through which the villagers used to go to hospitals, colleges,

markets, places of worship, schools, agricultural lands and government offices, etc.

3. The contention of the petitioners is that the respondent-authorities have undertaken the beautification and development of 'Rejali Talab' in public interest. The petitioners have no objection to the said beautification or development of the pond and fully support the said project. However, the grievance of the petitioners is that, while developing/beautifying the said pond, the existing pathway should not be obstructed or blocked. The petitioners represented the respondent-authorities, including the respondent no.2, in this regard, however, the same remained un-responded, which compelled them to prefer the present writ petition.

4. Mr. Ashish Kumar Shekhar, learned A.C. to S.C. (L&C)-II, appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that, if the petitioners prefer a fresh representation on the present issue before respondent no. 2, an appropriate decision will be taken by the said respondent within a stipulated time frame.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of the prayer made in the writ petition, this Court is of the view that the contention raised by the petitioners is primarily factual in nature and the same is required to be examined by the competent authority. Hence, the petitioners are given liberty to file a fresh representation on the present issue before the respondent no. 2 within three

weeks from today. On receipt of the said representation, the respondent no. 2, after calling for the relevant records and on getting an inquiry conducted, shall take an informed decision within four weeks thereafter. While taking the said decision, the respondent no. 2 may also provide an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners/their representatives, if so required.

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

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

***Rohit*/**
28.09.2026
Uploaded on 29.09.2026