IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.8207 of 2026

Bhola Prasad Yadav, son of Longi Yadav, resident of Dusad Para, P.O. & P.S.-Sahibganj (T), District-Sahibganj, Jharkhand.

..... Petitioner.

-Versus-

1. Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Railways, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
2. Railway Board, through its Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. General Manager, Eastern Railway, 17 Netaji Subhas Road, Kolkata.
4. Chief Administrative Officer (Construction)/Road Safety Project, Eastern Railway, Kolkata.
5. Chief Engineer (Construction)/Road Safety Project, Eastern Railway, Kolkata.
6. Divisional Railway Manager, Malda Division, Eastern Railway, Malda, West Bengal.
7. Deputy Chief Project Manager (Engineering), Gati Shakti Unit, Eastern Railway, Divisional Railway Manager's Office Building, Malda, West Bengal.
8. State of Jharkhand, through the Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Project Bhawan, Dhurwa, Ranchi.
9. Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Sahibganj.
10. Competent Authority-cum-District Land Acquisition Officer, Sahibganj.

..... Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ayush Aditya, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shirsh Mazumdar, AC to SC-II
For the Railways : Mrs. Bakshi Vibha, Advocate

Order No.04 **Date: 04.11.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking direction upon the Deputy Commissioner, Sahibganj (respondent no. 9) to take a decision on the petitioner's representation dated 17th August, 2026, filed against the proposed new alignment of the Railway Overbridge (ROB) for crossing the railway line at Level Crossing (LC) No. 82/B/T, near the West Cabin of Sahibganj

Railway Station, as the proposed alignment is likely to adversely affect the petitioner and others due to demolition of their residential houses.

2. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of prayer made in the writ petition, this Court is of the considered view that the present issue should be considered by a competent authority at the first instance.

3. It is jointly submitted by the learned counsel for the parties that the respondent no.9 is the competent authority.

4. Accordingly, the petitioner is given liberty to prefer a fresh representation, on the present issue, before the aforesaid respondent. On the receipt of the said representation, the respondent no.9, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and other concerned person(s), if so needed, shall take an appropriate informed decision within a period of six 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.)

Rohit/
04.11.2026
Uploaded on 04.11.2026