

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6567 of 2023**

---

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary-cum-Legal Remembrance, Law Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Registrar General, Patna High Court, Patna.
5. The District Judge, Samastipur, District- Samastipur.
6. The District Magistrate, Samastipur, District- Samastipur.
7. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patori, District- Samastipur.
8. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Patori, District- Samastipur.
9. The Circle Officer, Patori, District- Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

---

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate  
Mr. Surendra Kumar Mishra, Advocate  
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. D. Yadav (AAG-9)

---

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**and**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**  
**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

**Date : 05-05-2023**

The prayer in the writ petition is to construct the Civil Court Building, Shahpur Patori on the agricultural farm land or 100 metre north of Shahpur Patori Railway Station. The petitioner also seeks for setting aside the proposal of respondent no. 9 and to implement any other proposal beneficial to the



people of Shahpur Patori, District-Samastipur. The reliefs prayed for are in the form of questionnaire as to whether respondent no. 6 demanded a proposal from the Revenue Clerk for the aforesaid construction; whether on the report of Revenue Clerk respondent no. 9 sent a proposal and whether the Revenue Clerk sent a proposal for acquiring raiyati lands which are 5 kilometers away and is a flooded area with no access to communication. We are afraid that there is no public interest discernible from the aforesaid prayers made which is almost in the nature of seeking information for which there are adequate remedies available under the Right to Information Act, 2005.

In any event, we are not convinced there could be any such claim made in public interest, especially when the High Court is in seisin of the infrastructure needs of the District Courts. The land for construction of court complexes are first identified by the local inspection conducted by the District Judge and the District Magistrate upon which a proposal is sent either to the Law Department or to the High Court. The Infrastructure Committee of Judges appointed in the High Court then considers the proposal and then with appropriate consultation with the Law Department and the Building Construction Department approves the identification of the plot



and building construction for the purpose of establishment of  
Courts.

We are of the opinion that the writ petition lacks  
*bona fide*, and the same has to be dismissed *in limine*.

**(K. Vinod Chandran, CJ)**

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Anushka/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	09.05.2023
Transmission Date	

