

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4707 of 2025

=====

Rajesh Kumar Jha s/o Late Ramudar Jha, at Dumari Road, In front of N.C.C. Canteen, Near Power House, Maripur, Muzaffarpur, P.S. Sadar Muzaffarpur, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Land Revenue Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. Registrar, Registry Office, Muzaffarpur (East).
3. Anchal Adhikari, Gaighat, Muzaffarpur.
4. Birendra Kumar Jha, S/o Late Bhawneshwar Jha, At Bhabha Nagar Bhagwanpur, P.S. Sadar Muzaffarpur, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : AC to GA-7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to GA-7.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that a frivolous writ application has been filed. It is next submitted that the instant writ application has been filed for a direction upon the Respondent No. 2 not to register the sale deed of the joint land/property of the petitioner in the name of Respondent No. 4 or any other family members till the final decision in T.S. No. 332 of 2017 is made. The learned State counsel submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that how such prayer in writ application could have been made. It is



further submitted that the writ court cannot restrain any authority from registering the land on the ground that a title suit is pending, when the document presented for registration is in accordance with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908. It is also submitted that a person cannot transfer better title than what he has. It is next submitted that a person either purchases a property or bag of litigation, as such if any one is interested in purchasing the property, which is subject matter of Title Suit No. 332 of 2017, then the same is to his peril.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, as such the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application.

4. Accordingly, the instant writ application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

