

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.43 of 2017

=====

Bachchu Ravidas, son of late Ramdhani Ravidas, resident of village-
Ambedkar Nagar Harnaut, P.S.-Harnaut, District-Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, Through the District Magistrate Nalanda At Biharsharif
2. The Superintendent of Police, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
3. The Sub-Divisional Police Officer, Biharsharif, District-Nalanda.
4. The Officer-in-Charge, Harnaut Police Station, District-Nalanda (Biharsharif).
5. Bunni Devi, wife of Arun Tanti, at present residing at village-Gogipar Harnaut, P.S.-Harnaut, District-Nalanda at Biharsharif.
6. Sri Arun Tanti, son of Jitan Tanti at present residing at village-Gogipar Harnaut, P.S.-Harnaut, District-Nalanda at Biharsharif.
7. Jaymanti Devi, wife of late Raghunath Prasad, resident of village-Gogipar Harnaut, P.S.-Harnaut, District-Nalanda at Biharsharif.
8. Anil Prasad, son of late Prayag Tanti, resident of village-Gogipar Harnaut, P.S.-Harnaut, District-Nalanda at Biharsharif.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mahendra Thakur

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sheo Shankar Pd. (SC8)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 13-04-2017 The petitioner has prayed for issuance of mandamus

against the respondents commanding them not to interfere in the

peaceful possession of the petitioner over the referred land.

The points which have been raised for consideration
are; (i) whether the private respondent nos. 5 and 6 deliberately
wants to dispossess the petitioner without any authority (ii)
whether the respondent nos.5 and 6 have any right over the land in
question and (iii) whether other respondents are sitting tight over
the matter in collusion with the respondent nos.5 and 6.



Learned counsel for the State-respondents submits that this is a matter of land dispute between the private individuals which cannot be entertained in exercise of this extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court.

I find substance in the submission of learned counsel for the State. Apparently, the petitioner claims the referred land by virtue of registered sale deed executed by the respondent nos.7 and 8 in favour of the petitioner. The matter involves disputed question of facts wherein the writ Court cannot go into. Hence, this writ application is dismissed as devoid of merit.

Any observation of this Court shall not prejudice the civil right of the parties.

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

