

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2744 of 2016

=====

Nago Das S/o late Chhathu Das Resident of village-Bardaha, P.O -Goath,
Bardaha, Via- Saharsa Kachahari, P.s Ghailar madhepura District Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The I.G. of Registration Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector Madhepura.
4. The Deputy Collector of land Reforms , Madhepura.
5. The Circle officer, Ghailardh, Madhepura.
6. Md. Rojit Son of late Sakhabat Miyan R/o Village- Bardaha, P.s Ghailar,
District Madhepura.
7. Sri Maheshwar Kumar
8. Sri Sidheshwar Das Both are Son of late Dhodhai Das R/o Vill- Bardaha, P.s
Ghailar Distt Madhepura.
9. Sukan Das
10. Sri Saini Das Both are Son of late Nakchhedi Das R/o Vill- Bardaha, P.s
Ghailar Distt Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjit Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to GA-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief(s):

*“(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ,
order/direction in the nature of 'Certiorari' to set
aside the impugned JAMABANDI no. 270 dated
06.07.2013 of the Pvt. Respondent No. 6 namely
Md. Rojit son of Late Sakhawat Miyan (Annexure-*



4) and also set aside the impugned Sale Deed No. 4625 dated 25.03.2013 (Annexure-3) of the Pvt. Respondent Md. Rojit for the land in question.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ order/direction in the nature of 'mandamus' directing and commanding the concern authorities to issue the up to date current revenue rent receipt for the area of land 5 decimal to the petitioner on account his running jamabandi No. 860 from the said Khata and Kheshra.

(iii) For issuance of an appropriate writ order or direction in the nature of 'Mandamus' directing and commanding the concern respondents not to disturb the petitioners Jamabandi No. 860 for the said land in question.

(iv) For any other relief or reliefs to which the petitioner found entitled to may kindly be allowed to the petitioner.”

3. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he shall be approaching the competent authority against the order in question but since the matter was pending before this Court, there has been certain delay.



4. Learned State counsel has no objection on petitioner moving before the appropriate authority.

5. In that background, the writ petition stands disposed of with the observation that if the petitioner approaches the competent authority in next four weeks, the concerned authority shall see to it that the matter was pending before this Court for long while dealing with the limitation petition.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

