

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3009 of 2025

-
1. Mithilesh Singh @ Mithilesh Kumar son of Late Siyaram Singh @ Late Siyaram Mahto Resident of village- Rampur Alauli, P.S.- Alauli District - Khagaria.
 2. Satya Narayan Singh, Son of Late Mangal Singh @ Late Mangal Mahto Resident of village- Rampur Alauli, P.S.- Alauli District - Khagaria.
 3. Anil Singh @ Anil Kumar Singh, Son of Birji Lal Singh @ Brij Lal Mahto Resident of village- Rampur Alauli, P.S.- Alauli District - Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms Govt. of Bihar Patna.
2. The District Collector cum District Magistrate, Khagaria.
3. The Additional Collector, Khagaria.
4. The D.D.C., Khagaria.
5. The D.C.L.R., Khagaria.
6. The Circle Officer, Alauli, P.S.- Alauli, District- Khagaria.
7. Panchayat Secretary, Alauli, Khagaria.
8. The Mukhiya Gram Panchayat Raj Rampur Alauli, P.S. Alauli District- Khagaria.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Choudhary
For the Respondent/s : AC to SC-16

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 25-03-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned AC to SC-16.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that land pertaining to Thana No. 199, Khata No. 226, Khesra No. 04, Area-10 katha at Mauza- Charrapati, is purchased as well as settled land in favour of the ancestors of the petitioners.



3. It is next submitted that a proposal was sent for construction of *Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan* over the land in dispute, which was objected by the petitioners, as such the Circle Officer issued Memo No. 83 dated 9-1-2025 addressed to the petitioners seeking their response with regard to the land in dispute, i.e., if they had any document to substantiate that the land belongs to them, in that event they should appear before him and produce the document.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that a frivolous writ application has been filed seeking a writ of mandamus. It is next submitted that the writ application has been filed against a notice issued by the Circle Officer, it is further submitted that by mere issuance of a notice, no right of the petitioners stands affected. It is further submitted that petitioners instead of rushing to this Court, ought to have moved before the Circle Officer submitting all their documents with regard to the land in dispute to establish that the land belongs to them, but then instead of resorting to the remedy available in law, the present writ application has been filed.

5. The Court is in complete agreement with the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, thus finds no merit in the writ application.



6. Accordingly, the writ application is dismissed.

7. However, the dismissal of writ application will not preclude the petitioners from moving before the Circle Officer with all the relevant documents for establishing that the land belong to them.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

