IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
W.P. (C.) No. 2786 of 2012
----

1. Braj Mohan Singh
2. Krishna Mohan Singh, both are sons of Late Gopal Narayan Singh
3. Asha Singh, wife of Sri Braj Mohan Singh
4. Satyendra Kumar Singh, son of Late Munilal Singh
All are residents of Indrapuri, Road No.9, Ratu Road, PS – Sukhdeonagar, District – Ranchi, Jharkhand

.... Petitioners

-- Versus --

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi
3. The Additional Collector, Ranchi
4. The Circle Officer, Town Anchal, Ranchi
5. Anita Sharma, wife of Late Kaushalendra Narayan Sharma, R/o Hawai Nagar, Hinoo, PO and PS – Jagarnathpur, District - Ranchi

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners	:-	Mr. Vijoy Pratap Singh, Sr. Advocate
	:-	Mrs. Bandana Kri. Sinha, Advocate
	:-	Mrs. Ragini Kumari, Advocate
For the State	:-	Mr. Vineet Prakash, Advocate
For respondent No.5	:-	Mr. Sushawan Bhawmik, Advocate
	:-	Mr. Vedabrata Banerjee, Advocate

---

*28/**17.08.2026*** Heard learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the newly added respondent No.5.

2. This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for restraining the respondents from interfering

with the right, title and enjoyment of land covered under four sale deeds all dated 16.02.1989 in relation to Khata No.113/119, R.S. Plot No.83, Sub-Plot No.83/A/I (purchased by the petitioner No.1 vide sale deed No.1902 dated 16.02.1989 area 0.50 acres), sub-plot No.83/A/III (purchased by the petitioner No.2 vide sale deed No.1903 dated 16.02.1989 area 0.50 acres), sub-plot No.83/A/II (Purchased by the petitioner No.3 vide sale deed No.1901 dated 16.02.1989 area 0.50 acres and sub-plot No.83/A/IV (purchased by the petitioner No.4 vide sale deed No.1904 dated 16.02.1989 area 0.50 acres) and over which the name of respective petitioners have been mutated in mutation cases 439R 27/1989-90, 440R 27/1989-90, 437R27/1989-90 and 438R27/1989-90 respectively. Prayer No.2 is a consequential prayer.

3. Mr. Singh, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the validity of settlement in favour of Ishwar Dayal Singh was quashed by order dated 03.06.2002 passed by the Deputy Commissioner and order dated 02.07.2002 passed by Commissioner, vide judgment dated 25.04.2003 passed in W.P. (C.) No.4320 of 2002 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. He further submits that against that the State has preferred L.P.A. being L.P.A. No.818 of 2003 and the same was also dismissed by judgment dated 13.12.2004 contained in Annexure-9 and 10 respectively. He then submits that the petitioners' case and claim are fully covered by judgments and orders and in relation to subject matter of same

Hukumnama and same khata and settlement made to Ishwar Dayal Singh. He next submits that said Ishwar Dayal Singh has sold the area of which the petitioners have purchased to one J.N. Singh and J.N. Singh purchased sale deed dated 18.01.1965 contained in Annexure-12 of the writ petition. He also submits that the petitioners have purchased exactly the same land from J.N. Singh. He next submits that in view of judgment of LPA court, the dispute is set at rest and LPA Court order has not been challenged in the Apex Court and as such the said order has attained finality. He next submits that the petitioners are in possession which also fortified in light of mutation order contained in Annexure-5 series. On these grounds, he submits that the prayer made in the writ petition may kindly be allowed.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.5 submits that the respondent No.5 is in possession and he also purchased the land in 1936 by way of registered sale deed.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that there is disputed question of fact and in view of that only competent court of civil jurisdiction can decide the same.

6. It is well settled that long running jamabandi cannot be cancelled even if the State is claiming the said land.

7. Admittedly, the mutation has been done in favour of the petitioners and if any other parties are aggrieved with the possession of the petitioners, law is further well settled that it can

be decided by competent court of civil jurisdiction.

8. In that view of the matter, this writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents not to disturb the possession of the petitioners, if they are in possession in absence of any decree of a competent court of civil jurisdiction in favour of any other person.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 17.08.2026
Sangam/