

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P (C) No. 3176 of 2026

1. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Son of Kuldip Singh.
 2. Sandip Kumar Singh, Son of Pramod Singh.
- Both are resident of Village & P.S.-Chhattar Mandu, P.S. & District-Ramgarh, Jharkhand.

... Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. The Union of India through its D.R.M. South Eastern Railway, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S.-Hatia, Dist.-Ranchi.
2. The Executive Engineer, South Eastern Railway, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S.-Hatia, Dist.-Ranchi.
3. The Divisional Engineer (East)/RNC, South Eastern Railway, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S.-Hatia, Dist. –Ranchi.
4. The State of Jharkhand.
5. The Deputy Commissioner, Ramgarh, P.O. & P.S.-Ramgarh, Dist.-Ramgarh.
6. The Circle Officer, Anchal- Ramgarh, P.O. & P.S.-Ramgarh, Dist.-Ramgarh.

... Respondent(s).

CORAM :SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Akhouri Sankalp, Advocate

For the respondent(s) : Mr. Dinesh Krishna, (S.C. Mines-III)

: Mr. Faisal Allam, A.C. to S.C. Mines-III

: Mr. Prashant Pallav, ASGI

: Ms. Shreya Shukla, A.C. to ASGI

.....

02/04.05.2026:

1. Heard the parties.
2. The petitioner in this writ petition prays for the following reliefs:-
 - i. *“For quashing of order dated 30.10.2021 (Annexure-11) passed by respondent no. 5 as well as order dated 11.07.2019 vide Memo No. 1622 (Annexure-12) and order dated 16.10.2021 vide Letter No. 2159 (Annexure-12/1), passed by respondent no. 6, whereby and whereunder the claim of the petitioners has been illegally rejected without any basis and without any reasoned order and also not providing the sufficient opportunity to the petitioners to hear.*
 - ii. *For direction the petitioners to make payment of compensation amount to the petitioners for the lands of the petitioner, which has been acquired for construction of the road by the concerned respondents at Chhattar Mandu, Ramgarh.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent Union of India has encroached the land of the petitioner for construction of road.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State categorically denies the said statement and has submitted that a report was called for and after the inspection, it was found that the construction which is being made is within the boundary of the railways and no land of the petitioner has been encroached.
5. Considering the rival submissions, I am of the opinion that the same cannot be decided in an application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner if so advised may approach the appropriate Civil Court for the relief claimed.
6. Accordingly, this writ petition stands disposed of.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)