

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 7821 of 2025

Md. Shabbir Ansari, age about 32 years, son of Rabbul Ansari, R/o Muslim Muhalla, Village-Tantri South, PO-Tupkadih, PS-Jaridih, District-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
... ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. The Chief Executive Officer, Bokaro Steel Ltd., Office at PO + PS-Bokaro Steel City, Dist-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
3. Director, Directorate of Project land and rehabilitation, PO + PS-Bokaro Steel City, Dist-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
4. Deputy Commissioner, Bokaro, PO + PS-Bokaro, Bokaro Steel City, Dist-Bokaro, Jharkhand.
5. Abdul Rab Akhtar, age about 35 years, son of Late Samiruddin Ansari, Resident of Sector-3A, Qr. No.396, PO + PS-Bokaro Steel City, Dist- Bokaro, Jharkhand Permanent Resident of Muslim Mohalla, Village-Tupkadih, PO- Tupkadih, PS-Jaridih, Dist-Bokaro, Jharkhand.

... ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Kishore Kr. Singh, SC-V

02/ 07th January, 2026

1. Heard the parties.
2. By filling this writ petition, the petitioner has prayed for a direction upon the respondents i.e., respondent Nos.1 to 4 to cancel the appointment which has been granted to respondent No.5 in lieu of acquisition of the land and to appoint the petitioner.
3. From the argument of the parties, I find that the petitioner claims to be the actual descendant of the land losers. It is his case that the respondent No.5 does not belong from the same family, thus respondent No.5 was not entitled for the appointment, which was wrongly granted to him.
4. As per the argument of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Steel Authority of India Limited, the original landholder had two daughters. The petitioner is the descendant from one daughter and respondent No.5 from other. He submits

that since the award was not prepared in the name of the mother of this petitioner, rather it was prepared in the name mother of respondent No.5, the respondent No.5 was given appointment. It is his contention that there was family disputes which is now being agitated by filing this writ application. Further, the appointment which has been given in the year 2008 is being challenged now.

5. After hearing the parties, I find that the main dispute and difference between the parties is in respect of genealogy. The petitioner has to establish the genealogy and right of inheritance. As there are several disputed questions of facts which cannot be looked by this Court, further what the petitioner claims needs to be established by leading documentary and oral evidence which also cannot be looked into in this writ application filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition. Accordingly, this writ petition stands **dismissed**.

6. Liberty is reserved to the petitioner to approach the appropriate Civil Court for redressal of his grievance.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

07.01.2026
S.K.D., cp2

Uploaded on 09.01.2026