

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9643 of 2016

=====

Sushil Kumar Choudhary son of late Kishori Choudhary, Resident of Raj Bagh, P.S.- Pupri, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
3. The Sub-Divisionla Officer, Sitamarhi.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Sitamarhi.
5. The Circle Officer, Pupri, Sitamarhi.
6. Om Prakash Srivastava, the then Circle Officer, Pupri, Sitamarhi.
7. The Circle Inspector, Pupri, Sitamarhi.
8. Kartik Verma, son of Kailash Prasad Verma, Resident of Village P.O.- Jhajhihar, P.S.- Pupri, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mrs. Shama Sinha, Advocate Ms. Asmita, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, SC-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 21-02-2024 This matter is being taken up through 'Virtual Mode.'

2. Heard Mrs. Shama Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner duly assisted by Ms. Asmita and Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, learned AC to SC-10.

3. The petitioner has prayed for the following relief:

*(i) for quashing the order dated 20.02.2014
passed in Mutation Case No. 1932 of 2013-14
by respondent No.5 whereby and whereunder he
has rejected the application filed by the*



petitioner for mutation of 20 decimal land in Thana No. 184 situated over Khata No. 1112, 1113 and 109 bearing respective Khesra No. 2573, 2574 and 2575;

(ii) for quashing the order dated 26.12.2015 passed in Mutation Appeal No. 63 of 2014-15 passed by respondent No. 4 whereby and whereunder he has affirmed the order dated 20.02.2014 passed in Mutation Case No. 1732 of 2013-14 by respondent No. 5;

(iii) for direction to the respondent concerned to mutate the 20 decimal land of the petitioner Thana No. 184 situated over Khata No. 1112, 1113 and 109 bearing respective Khesra No. 2573, 2574 and 2575 through Sale Deed No. 9481 dated 25.09.2013;

(iv) the petitioners further prays for issuance of writ/ writs, order/orders, direction/directions for the following relief/reliefs which he is entitled to in the fact and circumstances of the present case.

4. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner



submits that she may be permitted to approach an appropriate authority by preferring an appropriate petition as the order has been passed in Mutation Appeal No. 63/2014-15 disposed of on 26.12.2015.

5. The State has no objection.

6. In that view of the matter, the writ petition stands disposed of permitting the petitioner to move an appropriate authority within a period of four weeks from today. If the same is preferred within the aforesaid period, the authority shall take into account that the writ petition was preferred against the said order on 16.6.2016 and the matter was pending in this Court while deciding the limitation petition.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

