

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18283 of 2018

=====

Baljeet Mahto Son of Late Ramnandan Mahto, Resident of Village-Sasaula,
P.s.-Mejarganj, Distirct-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
3. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Sitamarhi Sadar, District-Sitamarhi.
4. The Circle Officer, Riga, Sitamarhi.
5. Om prakash Mahto, Son of Bhola Mahto, Resident of Village-Bela
Sahwazpur, P.s.-Riga, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Saroj Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 22-09-2025 Heard Mr. Saroj Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, learned GP-14.

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

*(i) for issuance of a writ in the nature of
certiorari to quash the order of Deputy
Collector Land Reforms, Sitamarhi Sadar,
District-Sitamarhi passed in Mutation
Appeal No.40/2015-16 vide order dated
11.04.2018 by which he has been set aside
the order dated 06.02.2015 passed by*



Learned Circle Officer, Riga in Case No.3394/2014-15 by which an area of 0.02 decimals land of Bhawadepur Bazar, Thana No.258, Ward No.13, Khesra No.202 was allowed to be mutated in favour of Baljeet Mahto (Petitioner) accordingly jamabandi has been corrected and the Petitioner after making payment of rent he has obtained the receipts of Malgujari and Holding Tax (ii) and further for a direction to restrain the Circle Officer, Riga not to proceed with the matter..

3. Learned State counsel submits that the order has been passed by Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Sitamarhi and the petitioner ought to have approached the appropriate superior authority/forum for the redressal of the grievance.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner after some argument submits that he shall be approaching the said authority but there has been delay as the petitioner was pursuing the matter before this Court for last seven years.

5. Considering the submissions of the parties, instead of keeping the writ petition pending, it is disposed of granting



liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority in next four weeks and if the same is filed, the concerned authority shall be taking note of the fact that the petitioner was pursuing the matter before this Court for last seven years while dealing with the limitation petition.

6. It is further expected that the matter will be taken to its logical conclusion at an earliest.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

