

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17962 of 2024

=====

Amrit Das Son of Ram Roop Das, Resident of Village - Mathura, P.O. -
Gokula, P.S. - Shikarpur, District - West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, Bihar.
2. The Collector, West Champaran.
3. The Sub - Divisional Officer, Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms. Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.
5. The Anchal Adhikari (Circle Officer), Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.
6. The Revenue Karamchari, Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.
7. Ram Roop Das Son of - Late Ram Snehi Das, Resident of Village - Mathura,
P.O. - Gokula, P.S. Shikarpur, District- West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mohammad Abu Shajar
For the Respondent/s : AC to SC-7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-11-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to SC-7.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
State submits that petitioner has remedy of appeal before the
D.C.L.R against the order impugned in the instant writ
application, but instead of availing the remedy of appeal, the
petitioner has rushed to this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the State further fairly
submits that earlier the application seeking mutation of the land
in question was rejected by the Circle Officer Narkatiyaganj,



against which the petitioner moved in appeal before the D.C.L.R and the D.C.L.R, after setting aside the order of the Circle Officer, directed the Circle Officer to act in accordance with Mutation Act 2011, in pursuance whereof, the petitioner again moved before the Circle Officer when his application for mutation again came to be rejected by an order dated 21-8-2024, which is impugned in the instant writ application.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the D.C.L.R in appeal had directed the Circle Officer to act in accordance with law and the Circle Officer by the impugned order again rejected the application of the petitioner seeking mutation over the land on the ground that he was not able to produce any document.

5. The said submission of the learned State counsel is rebutted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. It is submitted that earlier when the Circle Officer had rejected the mutation application of the petitioner, the same was challenged before the D.C.L.R; and the D.C.L.R, after setting aside the order of the Circle Officer, had directed the Circle Officer to mutate the name of the petitioner, but then Circle Officer, in complete breach of the said order in appeal by the D.C.L.R, again passed the order impugned, on which the



learned State counsel submits that the Circle Officer had to act in accordance with law and if petitioner is aggrieved by the order impugned, he still has remedy of appeal and revision and thereafter before the B.L.T, but then without availing the remedy, the petitioner cannot rush to this court.

6. The Court finds merit in the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, as such, the application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

