

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10291 of 2020

=====

Smt. Veena Devi @ Vina Devi Wife of Jagesar Ram Resident of Village-
Ragho Majhauri, P.S.- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Muzaffarpur Division, District- Muzaffarpur.
4. The Collector, Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.
5. The Additional Deputy Collector, Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.
6. The Deputy Collector, Land Revenue, East Muzaffarpur, District- Muzaffarpur.
7. The Circle Officer, Bochaha, P.S. and Block- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur.
8. Dinesh Ram Son of Jugeshwar Ram Resident of Village- Ragho Majhauri, P.S.- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rishi Raj Sinha, SC 19
		Mr. Birendra Prasad Singh, AC to SC 19

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 06-11-2023 Heard the parties.

2. This writ application has been filed for quashing of the order dated 16.03.2020 passed by Addl. Collector, Muzaffarpur in Mutation Revision Case No. 103 of 2017-18 by which Addl. Deputy Collector has stayed the operation of the order passed by the Circle Officer, Bochaha, Muzaffarpur in Mutation Case No. 4830 of 2013-14 dated 16.01.2014 and followed up the order passed by the Deputy Collector, Land Revenue in Mutation Appeal Case No. 15 of 2015-16. It is further prayed that the order passed by respondent nos. 6 and 7 with regard to land in question was mutated in favour of the petitioner and accordingly, *jamabandi* was created in her name



may be restored.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during pendency of this application, the Addl. Collector, Muzaffarpur remanded the matter back to the Circle Officer, Bochaha, Muzaffarpur for passing fresh order in the matter.

4. In that view of the matter, this application has become infructuous.

This application is dismissed as having become infructuous. However, the petitioner is given liberty to move before the competent authority for redressal of her grievances.

5. It goes without saying that if any question of limitation arises before the competent authority, the same shall be considered taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner was pursuing the issue before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this application is disposed of.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Harsh/

U			
---	--	--	--

