

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.754 of 2025

Indal Mukhiya alias Inder Mukhiya Son of Late Uchit Mukhiya, Resident of Village- Ghatwar Tole, Ward No.-3, Bazar Samiti, Jainagar, P.S. and Anchal-Jainagar, Distt.- Madhubani (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Collector of District Madhubani.
2. The Collector, Madhubani.
3. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Jainagar, Madhubani.
4. The Anchla Adhikari, Jainagar, Madhubani.
5. Sri Lakshmi Mukhiya Son of Late Sone Mukhiya, Resident of Village- Ghatwar Tole, Ward No.-3, Bazar Samiti, Jainagar, P.S. and Anchal-Jainagar, Distt.- Madhubani (Bihar).
6. Most. Sita Devi Wife of Late Fuldev Mukhiya, Resident of Village- Ghatwar Tole, Ward No.-3, Bazar Samiti, Jainagar, P.S. and Anchal- Jainagar, Distt.- Madhubani (Bihar).
7. Ramashish Mukhiya Son of Late Videshi Mukhiya, Resident of Village- Ghatwar Tole, Ward No.-3, Bazar Samiti, Jainagar, P.S. and Anchal-Jainagar, Distt.- Madhubani (Bihar).

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shashi Nath Jha
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (24)
		Mr. AC to SC-24

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned AC to SC-24 for the State.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the instant writ application has been filed seeking a direction upon the authorities to comply the order dated 18.11.2022 passed by the DCLR in Bihar Land Dispute Resolution Case No.15 of 2022-23. Further to direct the Circle Officer to ensure the possession of the present petitioner over the land in question as directed and determined by the DCLR vide his order dated



18.11.2022 annexed as Annexure-3 to the writ application. Further to hold that respondent authorities are bound to comply the order and direction dated 18.11.2022 under Section 15 of the B.L.D.R. Act, 2009 in true letter and spirit as the order has attained finality in the eyes of law.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the writ application appears to be misconceived for the reason that the same has been filed seeking a direction upon the Circle Officer to comply the order of the DCLR. It is next submitted that if the DCLR has passed an order and the same is not being complied whether the Court in a mechanical manner would issue a writ of mandamus directing the Circle Officer to comply the order of the DCLR or the petitioner ought to have moved before a competent authority bringing to his notice that the order of the DCLR is not being complied with.

4. After hearing the learned State counsel, the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application.

5. The writ application is dismissed accordingly.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

