

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P. (C) No. 1544 of 2026

Biswajit Nath Shahdeo, S/o Late Sureshwar Nath Shahdeo, R/o
Village-Kute, P.O.-Dhurwa, P.S.-Jagarnathpur, District-Ranchi
..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through Chief Secretary, Ranchi
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration
and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
3. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi
4. The Circle Officer, Argora, Ranchi
5. The Municipal Commissioner, Ranchi Municipal Corporation,
Ranchi
6. The Chief Engineer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi
7. The Executive Engineer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi
..... Respondents

CORAM

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

For the Petitioner:	Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate
For the Res.-RMC:	Mr. Prashant Kr. Singh, Advocate
	Mr. Karbir, Advocate

02/16.03.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The petitioner seeks the following substantive reliefs in this writ
petition:

- “(i) For quashing the Notice Inviting Tender issued vide Letter No.
200/Eng. Dated 22.01.2026 (Annexure-6) by the respondent
no. 7, i.e., the Executive Engineer, Ranchi Municipal
Corporation, Ranchi, whereby tender has been issued for
construction of a boundary wall over the so-called vacant land
of Ranchi Municipal Corporation near Doranda Community Hall
under Ward No. 45, as the land under question does not belong
to Ranchi Municipal Corporation but is part of Barkagarh Estate,
over which the respondents have no right, title or authority.
- (ii) For direction upon the respondent authorities not to proceed
with or carry out any construction activity pursuant to the
aforesaid tender notice over the land in question during the
pendency of instant writ petition.”

3. Though the relief is sought in form of a challenge to the tender
notice, the petitioner's case is that the tender has been issued for

constructing a boundary wall over the property, which the petitioner's claims to be a part of Barkagarh Estate.

4. From the averments made in the writ petition and also the prayer clauses, it is evident that the dispute raised by the petitioner is a purely civil dispute relating to ownership and possession of the land in question. Such a dispute cannot be adjudicated by this Court exercising its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution.
5. On the above ground, we decline to entertain this writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.
6. However, this dismissal will not preclude the petitioner from filing appropriate proceedings before appropriate forum for protection of his alleged civil rights in respect of the property in question.
7. All contentions of the parties in this regard are kept explicitly open.
8. No costs.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(RAJESH SHANKAR, J.)

16.03.2026
Satish/Vikas/