

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4698 of 2018

-
-
1. Smt. Parwati Devi, Wife of Krishna Narayan Singh
 2. Smt. Munni Devi, wife of Ram Vijay Singh Both Residents of Chandauti, P.S. Chandauti, District- GayaBihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
3. The District Collector, Gaya.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Gaya.
5. The Circle Officer, Gaya.
6. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Law and Justice, New Delhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Brijeshwar Narayan Singh
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. S.D Sanjay, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Raj Kishore Roy, GP-18
		Mr. Anshay Bahdur Mathur, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

- 2 09-05-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The petitioners have filed the instant application for the following relief(s):-

“1. That this is an application for issuance of an appropriate Writ/Order/Direction in the nature of certiorari Mandamus quashing the order dated 21.12.2017 contained in Annexure-1 and issue direction to Respondent 4 and 5 to carry out necessary changes in Record of Rights/Khatian and Mutation of Plot No. 528 and 561 of Kata No. 108 situated in Chandauti under Revenue Circle of Chandauti Block of



Gaya District in favour of petitioners and accordingly open separate Demands of the said lands in terms of the Declaration made by the Learned Munsif, 1st, Gaya in T.S. No. 40/2003 on 03.10.2013 decreeing that the suit lands are Raiyati lands of petitioners/plaintiffs.”

3. It is the case of the petitioners that the case relating to the land in question was decreed in favour of the petitioners by judgment and decree passed in Title Suit No.40 of 2003 on 3.10.2013 by the learned Munsif 1st, Gaya.

4. In spite of the decree in the petitioners' favour, the land in question is not being mutated by the respondents.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the writ petition filed by the petitioners is lacking in details in so far as no statement has been made in any of the paragraphs that the petitioners filed any petition for mutating the land in question in his favour or that the petition filed by the petitioners is pending before any of the respondents.

6. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw this application with liberty to file an appropriate application for mutating his name with respect to the land in question before the respondent authority concerned.



7. The application is disposed of as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

8. It goes without saying that in case any application is filed by the petitioners before the respondent authorities for mutating their names, the respondent concerned shall proceed in accordance with law and decide their application at the earliest.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

