

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4409 of 2017

=====

Lalan Pandey S/o Late Nemdhari Pandey R/o Village P.O. - Divian, P.S.
Kargahar, Dist. Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Bihar Land Tribunal, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director Consolidation, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Deputy Director Consolidation, Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. The Consolidation Officer, Kargahar, Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rewti Kant Raman
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Subhash Chandra Yadav- GP-15

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

7 17-03-2025 Heard the parties.

2. This writ petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 22-12-2016 passed by the Chairman, Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 1383 of 2015 whereby he confirmed the order dated 05-06-2015 passed by the Director, Consolidation, Bihar, Patna whereby the order dated 13-11-2009 passed by the Deputy Director (Consolidation), Rohtas at Sasaram in Consolidation Appeal No. 07 of 2009-10 was set aside.

3. The land, in question was recorded as Gair Majorua Malik in revenue records. The petitioner claims the land, in question as his raiyati land. At the stage of Section-10 of Bihar Consolidation of Holding & Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1956, the petitioner did not file any objection before the Consolidation Officer



challenging the entries in revenue records. The stage of Section-10 was finalized and the land was recorded as *Gair Majarua Malik* in consolidation scheme also. From perusal of the impugned order dated 22-12-2016 passed by the Chairman, Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 1383 of 2015, it transpires that the learned Chairman refrained from interfering with the order of the revisional authority on these grounds and also on the ground that Title Suit No. 37 of 2002 is pending before the Civil Court of competent jurisdiction.

4. The applications of the petitioner were dismissed by the learned B.L.T. and it was observed that the petitioner may pursue his claim by filing a suit before the competent civil court.

5. I do not find any illegality, irregularity or impropriety in the impugned order.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

U			
---	--	--	--

