

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7704 of 1996

=====

Arjun Prasad Yadav (husband of deceased petitioner), son of Gokul Prasad Yadav,
resident of Village Daharpur, P.S. Ghosi, District Jehanabad.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State of Bihar.
2. The Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
3. The Additional Collector, Jehanabad, District Jehanabad.
4. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Jehanabad, District Jehanabad.
5. The Anchal Adhikari, Ghosi Anchal, District Jehanabad.
- 6 (a) Maharani Devi, wife of late Tulshi Mistry.
(b) Rama Mistry
(c) Chhotan Mistry
(d) Udai Mistry
(e) Awadhesh Mistry

All are sons of late Tulshi Mistry and are resident of Village-
Daharpur, PS- Ghoshi, District- Jehanabad.

- (f) Sumitra Devi, daughter of late Tulshi Mistry and wife of Surendra Mistry,
resident of Village- Rasula, PS- Kako, District- Jehanabad.
- (g) Kiran Devi, daughter of Late Tulshi Mistry and wife of Surendra Mistry,
resident of village- Benipur, PS- Ekangarsarai, District- Nalanda.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Laxmi Narayan Das, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rupak Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent-State: Mr. Mukund Mohan Jha, AC to GP-27.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-10-2018

In this writ petition the petitioner has questioned the order passed by the respondent no.2, the Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya in Case No.4 of 1976 affirming the order dated 12.12.1995 passed by the respondent no.3, the Additional Collector, Jehanabad, in case no.4/A.C./90-91 and the order dated 22.04.1985 passed by the respondent no.4, the Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Jehanabad in Mutation Appeal No.3 of 1977-78, 2 of 1981-82 and 22



of 1983-84, whereby the petition of the petitioner for mutation of his name in the Jamabandi records has been rejected.

Considering the concurrent finding of facts by the statutory authorities at each stage, to reject the prayer of the petitioner for mutation, I am not persuaded to grant indulgence to the prayer made by the petitioner. The petitioner has alternative remedy and if so advised, he can take recourse thereto. No case for indulgence is made out.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/Anjula

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12-10-2018
Transmission Date	NA

