

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5191 of 2015**

Shivandan Prajapati S/o Shokrati Prajapati, R/o Village P.O.P.S. Nauhatta,  
District- Rohtas. ... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram.
3. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Dehri, Rohtas.
4. The Circle Officer, Nauhatta, Rohtas.
5. Tetari Devi W/o Vishwanath Prajapati, R/o Village.- Nauhatta P.O. P.S.-  
Nauhatta, District- Rohtas. ... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Kriti Kumari, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sudama Kumar, AC to SC-12  
For respondent no.5 : Mr. Brajesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      07-07-2025                      Heard Ms. Kriti Kumari, learned counsel for the  
petitioner, the State as also Mr. Brajesh Kumar Pandey, learned  
counsel representing the respondent no.5,

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

*(i) for issuance of the writ in nature of  
mandamus or any other appropriate writ,  
order or direction, commanding respondents  
specially Deputy Collector, Land Reform,  
Dehri to implement his order dated 2.3.2012  
passed in case no. 86(M)/11-12 or be please  
to pass such order or orders as the entitled.*



3. The petitioner came with a simple prayer, to implement the order passed by the learned Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Dehri in Case No. 86(M)/2011-12 passed on 02.03.2012 by which the Circle Officer, Nauhatta, Rohtas was directed to measure the land in the presence of respondent no.5 and further to get the land in question mutated (Annexure-2 of the writ petition).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that to the best of knowledge of the petitioner, the order attained finality as the same was never challenged. Submission is that still, the Circle Officer, Nauhatta, Rohtas has not implemented the order.

5. Learned counsel for respondent no.5 is appearing.

6. Learned counsel for the State submits that he will have to seek instruction and file reply.

7. It is unfortunate that two copies of the writ petition was served upon the State in the year 2015, a simple prayer has been made, to implement the order of the D.C.L.R., Dehri, Rohtas and ten years later, prayer for adjournment is being made. The State Counsel is even unable to inform whether he contacted the concerned respondent, the Circle Officer, Nauhatta, Rohtas to get updated information so that the same



can be apprised to the Court.

8. Learned counsel for respondent no.5 submits that against the said order, Appeal No. 341 of 2013-14 was preferred before the learned Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna which stands disposed of though he has no idea about the outcome of that order.

9. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of directing the Circle Officer, Nauhatta, Rohtas to look into the matter, go through the different orders, hear both sides and if the order of the Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Dehi, Rohtas has attained finality and/or affirmed by the Appellate Authority, he/she is duty bound to ensure its compliance within a period of eight weeks from the date, the petitioner presents the order of this Court before the said office.

10. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

11. Pending Interlocutory Application(s), if any also stand(s) disposed of.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Ravi/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

