

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2279 of 2015

=====

Manan Singh son of Late Raghunath Singh, resident of village- Mahuar,
P.S. Shahpur, dist. Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Buxar, Dist. Buxar.
2. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dumraon, Dist. Buxar.
3. The Circle Officer, Brahampur, Dist. Buxar.
4. The District Settlement Officer, Buxar, Dist. Buxar.
5. Gaya Rai son of Ramdayal Rai, resident of village-Mahuar, P.S. Shahpur, Dist. Buxar.
6. Ram Ekbal Rai son of Jirakhan Rai
7. Anirudh Rai son of Jagarnath Rai
8. Anand Rai son of Sabhapati Rai.
9. Premchandra Rai son of Sabhapati Rai
10. Kedarnath Rai,
11. Ganesh Rai,
12. Jagarnath Rai
13. Gangaphal Rai
All sons of Saryug Rai
14. Sabhapati Rai
15. Bideshi Rai
Both sons of Triveni Rai
16. Deo Kumar Rai
17. Mishri Rai
Both sons of Triveni Rai
18. Baij Nath Rai.
19. Chandra Kumar Rai
20. Prabhansh Rai
Sons of Gangaphal Rai R/o village Ghurahapur, P.S. Dumraon, Dist. Buxar.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shakti Suman Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. M.K. Ambastha GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

2 05-02-2015

Heard Mr. D.K. Tandon counsel for the petitioner

and AC to GP-14 for the State.

The petitioner seeks appropriate direction upon the

respondent-Settlement Officer to correct the entry in CS khatian by deleting the name(s) of the private respondents. The said claim is rested on a judgment passed by the Civil Court in Title suit no.64/14 and 147/15 of 1959/1962 rendered on 31st of March, 1964. From the pleadings of the writ petition, it is not apparent as to how the petitioners are parties to the said suit inasmuch as the details of land set out in the writ petition also do not tally with the CS khatian (Annexure-2). Seen thus, based on the pleadings on record, in my view, no relief can be granted to the petitioner.

Mr. Tandon after making submissions at some length states that the petitioner would approach the respondent Collector for redressal of the grievance as raised in the writ application. Be it noted that the counsel for the State, on the other hand, has contended that the remedy in the circumstances of the present case would lie to the Court of competent civil jurisdiction.

Considering the prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner, the application is permitted to be withdrawn with the liberty to approach the appropriate forum/authority for redressal of the grievance in accordance with law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

Shyam/-

U			
---	--	--	--