

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3145 of 2015

=====

Haridwar Anand Raj Son of Late Sukhdeo Gond, Resident of village -
Sadopur, P.S. - Chenari, District- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate , Rohtas, Sasaram.
3. The Additional District Magistrate (Revenue), Rohtas, Sasaram.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Revenue, Rohtas, Sasaram.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Rohtas, Sasaram.
6. The Circle officer Chenari, District- Rohtas.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Satyavrat Verma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ashok Kumar, SC 11

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

2 26-02-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

State.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that 79
decimals of land under Plot No. 52 appertaining to Khata No. 25,
Revenue P.S. No. 466 of Mauza Sonebarsa, district of Rohtas
stood mutated in the name of father of the petitioner. However,
it has come to the knowledge of the petitioner that the same has
mutated in the name of one Ram Pati Devi.

Learned counsel submits that he has filed objection
before the respondent no. 6, the Circle Officer, against that entry
but he is not being given the certified copy of the order

concerned and the petition filed by Ram Pati Devi upon which the decision was in the concerned mutation case making the entry in the name of Ram Pati Devi in place of the name of petitioner's deceased father.

In above view of the matter, this writ application is being disposed of with the direction to the respondent no. 6 to dispose of the petition filed by the petitioner as contained in Annexure 4 within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order in accordance with law. It goes without saying that if the name of the father of the petitioner was mutated earlier and in his place the name of other persons have been mutated subsequently then, if the petitioner files necessary requisites, the certified copy of the proceeding and the decision taken should also be supplied to him on payment of necessary fee.

However, it is made clear that this Court has not formed / expressed any opinion with respect to the merit of the case of the petitioner.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Spd/-

U			
---	--	--	--