IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(C) No. 8036 of 2026

Pushpa Kumari ….. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through its Chief Secretary, Ranchi
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
3. The Director General of Police, Jharkhand, Ranchi
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh
5. The Superintendent of Police, Hazaribagh
6. The Municipal Commissioner, Hazaribagh Municipal Corporation, Hazaribagh
7. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Hazaribagh
8. The Cricle Officer, Sadar, Hazaribagh
9. The Khas Mahal Officer, Hazaribagh
10. The Inspector of Police, Lohsinghna Police Station, Hazaribagh
11. The Assistant Electrical Engineer (Urban), Hazaribagh Electric Supply Area, Hazaribagh
12. Sanjay Saw
13. Subham Kumar Mehta
14. Vishal Kumar Verma ….. Respondents

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vinay Kumar, Advocate
For the State: Mr. Ajit Kumar, A.C to G.A-V
For Respondent No.6: Mr. Ranjan Pd. Sinha, Advocate

03/03.11.2026 The present writ petition was earlier taken up on 26.10.2026 and on the said date, the following order was passed:

> "The grievance of the petitioner is that though she has filed an application before the respondent No.7 requesting inter alia to take cognizance under Section 223 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for violation of the order of status-quo dated 18.05.2026 passed by the respondent No.7 at the instance of the respondent Nos. 13 & 14, however, the respondent No.7 is not taking up the same for consideration.
>
> 2. If the said fact stated in the present writ petition is correct, it is really a serious issue which requires intervention of this Court as prior to filing of the present writ petition, the petitioner had also preferred a writ petition being W.P.(C) No. 4647/2026, which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 03.07.2026 observing inter alia that in such a situation, the remedy lies by filing an

application under Section 223 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 and the petitioner should take recourse of the said provision by filing an appropriate application.

3. Ms. Moushmi Chatterjee, learned A.C to G.A-V appearing on behalf of the respondent-State, however, prays for a short adjournment to seek instruction on the present issue from the respondent No.7.

4. Considering the said prayer, put up this case on 03.11.2026 under the same heading."

2. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, Mr. Ajit Kumar, learned A.C to G.A-V, on instruction of the respondent No.7, submits that though the petitioner had filed an application, whereafter a report was called from the concerned police station, however, the report submitted by the police station does not find favour with the petitioner, as according to the said report, the private respondents have been making construction over some other land.

3. He, however, in reply to the query of the Court, submits that pursuant to the petitioner's application, no order has been passed by the respondent No.7 on the said application.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that once an application invoking a particular provision of law is preferred by a person, the administrative/quasi-judicial authority is required to consider the same and pass an appropriate speaking order in accordance with law.

5. However, in the present case, the respondent No.7, after receipt of the report from the concerned police station, has not passed any order on the petitioner's application. Accordingly, the respondent No.7 is directed to pass an appropriate speaking order on the petitioner's application after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner/her representative and the private respondents within six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

6. The present writ petition is accordingly disposed of with the aforesaid observation and direction.

Satish/- (RAJESH SHANKAR, J)