

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6982 of 2025

=====

Usha Devi W/o- Lal Bahadur Paswan, Resident of Village- South Tola,
Bochai P.S.- Muffasil, District- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principle Secretary Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Munger.
3. The Additional Collector (Revenue), Munger.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Munger.
5. The Executive Engineer Building Division, Munger.
6. The Circle Officer, Jamalpur, Munger.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shivendra Kumar Sinha- Advocate Mr. Ranjit Patel- Advocate Mr. Divit Vinod- Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Subhash Chandra Mishra- SC-16 Mr. AC to SC-16

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned AC to SC-16 for the State.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the ancestors of Late Nathu Ray had got the land in dispute from Raj Banaili. It is further submitted that Jamabandi No.185 is running in the name of Nathu Ray and petitioner is purchaser of the land in dispute in the instant writ application from the legal heirs of Nathu Ray. It is next submitted that petitioner after purchasing the land vide registered sale deed had applied for mutation before the Circle Officer, but then, an objection was



raised by a complete stranger based on which, the Circle Officer, Munger rejected the mutation application. It is next submitted that the Circle Officer though rejected the mutation application, but then, the order rejecting mutation case till date has not been supplied to the petitioner. It is next submitted that the authorities have given no objection with respect to the land in dispute for construction of Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan, though the land is purchased land of the petitioner from the legal heirs of Nathu Ray in whose name Jamabandi No.185 is still running.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State vehemently rebuts the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and submits that petitioner for the present does not have any locus to challenge the no objection given by the authorities for construction of Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan over the land in dispute for the reason that petitioner is purchaser of land and the land till date has not been mutated in his name. It is also submitted that petitioner instead of rushing to this Court ought to have moved before the DCLR in appeal assailing the order passed by the Circle Officer rejecting his mutation application.

4. The Court is in complete agreement with the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of



the State, as such, finds no merit in the writ application.

5. The writ application is thus dismissed.

6. It goes without saying that the dismissal of the writ application will in no way affect the case of the petitioner in appeal before the authority competent against the order passed by the Circle Officer rejecting his mutation case.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

