

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4432 of 2012

=====

Satya Narayan Singh son of late Ram Govind Rai, resident of village-
Chakki Bisheshwar Ka Dera, P.S. Brahmpur, District- Buxar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Collector, Buxar.
3. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Dumraon.
4. The Circle Officer, Brahmpur, District Buxar.
5. Ram Raj Rai, son of Indrasan Rai
6. Lalan Rai
7. Gopal Rai
8. Sheoji Rai, sons of late Kesho Rai.
9. Daya Shankar Rai
10. Uma Shankar
11. Shankar Rai, sons of late Lal Bahadur Rai.
12. Raj Keshari Devi, wife of late Ram Niwas
13. Raj Pati Devi, wife of late Kalika Singh, both daughters of late Indradeo Rai, respondent no. 5 to 13, all resident of Village Chakki, Bisheshwar K Dera, P.S. Brahmpur, District Buxar.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Sinha

For the Respondent No.1 to 4 : Mr. Pravin Kr. Verma, AC to SC-26

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 13-05-2016 Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the learned AC to SC-26 appearing on behalf of the respondent no. 1 to 4.

Indisputably, with respect to the lands in question, order of mutation was passed by the respondent Circle Officer, Brahmpur by order dated 15.12.1999 (Annexure-1) in favour of the private respondents. Father of the petitioner, being aggrieved by the aforesaid order, filed appeal before the respondent D.C.L.R., Dumraon, but that was rejected by order dated 10.07.2000 (Annexure-2). Thereafter, father of the petitioner filed Mutation Revision Case No. 77 of 2000, which was ultimately dismissed by the respondent District Collector, Buxar by order

dated 23.07.2001 (Annexure-3).

From the facts noticed above, it is apparent that by recording concurrent finding of facts, all the statutory revenue authorities have rejected the claim of mutation raised on behalf of the petitioner or his father by orders, as contained in Annexure-1, 2 and 3. Therefore, this Court does not find any good ground to interfere with the aforesaid three orders.

At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that for the lands in question, a Title Suit No. 210 of 2007 was filed in which both sides are parties. However, the final outcome of the aforesaid title suit is not known to the learned counsel for petitioner.

It goes without saying that if the competent civil court decides the claim of right and title of the petitioner with respect to the lands in question, then he shall be at liberty to approach the prescribed authority for grant of appropriate relief(s) with respect to the lands in question or for mutation of the lands in question.

With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present writ petition stands finally dismissed.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

BTiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--