

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21260 of 2014

=====

Mulchand Yadav son of Late Gujay Yadav. resident of Village - Chandrani,
P.S.- Dhamdaha, District - Purnea.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Collector of District - Purnea.
3. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Sadar Purnea.
4. The Circle Officer, Dhamdaha, District - Purnea.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar, AC to GA 1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-10-2016

The petitioner has filed the present writ petition seeking a direction to the respondent-authorities for mutation of his name with respect to the lands in question, fully detailed in paragraph 3 of the writ petition, which were allegedly settled in his favour under the provisions of The Bihar Bhoodan Yagna Act, 1954.

The learned AC to GA 1 appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that in the whole writ petition, the petitioner has not disclosed that he has filed a proper petition in the prescribed format under the provisions of The Bihar Land Mutation Act, 2011 (in short “the Act, 2011”).

In view of the nature of grievances/claims raised on behalf of the petitioner, he is granted liberty to file an appropriate petition in the prescribed format before the respondent Circle Officer, Dhamdah under Section 3 of the Act, 2011, after impleading all the necessary parties, for grant of appropriate relief(s) to him with respect to lands in question.

If such a petition is filed on behalf of the petitioner

within a period of two months from today with a certified copy of the present order, then the respondent Anchal Adhikari, Dhamdaha shall be obliged to initiate a proceeding under the provisions of the Act, 2011 and shall take it to its logical conclusion strictly in accordance with law, but before passing any final order, reasonable opportunity of hearing must be given to all concerned including the petitioner and other private individual, if any.

This is clarified that this Court has not gone into the merits of the claims raised on behalf of the petitioner and this is left to be decided by the statutory authority strictly in accordance with law.

The writ petition stands finally disposed of with the observations and directions made above.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Tahir/-

U			
---	--	--	--