

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1991 of 2025

-
1. Sanjay Kumar Pandey Son Late Hari Narayan Pandey, Resident of Village- Dumri, P.S.- Doriganj, District- Saran (Bihar).
 2. Langeswar Kumar Pandey @ Langanesh Kumar Pandey Son of Late Chandra Bhushan Pandey, Resident of Village- Dumri, P.S.- Doriganj, District- Saran (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra.
2. The District Magistrate, Saran At Chapra, District- Saran (Bihar).
3. The Additional District Magistrate, Saran At Chapra, District- Saran (Bihar).
4. The Zila Panchayat Raj Officer, Saran At Chhapra, District- Saran (Bihar).
5. The Block Development Officer, Sadar Chhapra, District- Saran (Bihar).
6. The Circle Officer, Sadar Chhapra, District- Saran (Bihar).

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rakesh Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kumar Pankaj, AC to SC-5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to SC-5.

2. Learned counsel for the State at the outset submits that the instant writ application has been filed against a notice issued by the Additional Collector, Saran in Jamabandi Cancellation Case No. 145/2024-25 directing the petitioner to produce evidence in support of his claim over the land in dispute in the instant writ application. It is further submitted that the petitioner has come before this Court against the notice which has been issued asking him to produce evidence with



respect to land in dispute. It is further submitted that the petitioner instead of rushing to this Court ought to have moved before the Additional Collector, Saran for getting the Jamabandi Cancellation Case No. 145 of 2024-25 adjudicated. It is also submitted that from perusal of the pleadings made in the writ application it would manifest that when Jamabandi was created the relevant date has also not been pleaded.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

4. The Court finds merit in the submissions made by learned counsel for the State, thus, finds no merit in the writ application. Accordingly, this writ application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

tusharika/-

U			
---	--	--	--

