

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14385 of 2015

-
1. Md. Jahangir Ansari and Ors Son of Late Nazruddin Ansari
 2. Maksud Alam, Son of Late Abdul Zabbar Ansari,
 3. Md. Aslam Gazi, Son of Late Suleman Gazi, All are residents of village - Jehanabad Kudra, P.O. and .P.S. - Kudra, District - Kaimur at Bhabhua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. Collector, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
3. Additional Collector, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
4. Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Mohania, District - Kaimur at Bhabhua.
5. Anchal Adhikari, Kudra, District - Kaimur at Bhabhua.
6. Ram Balak Das, Son of Bajrang Das, Sabait Jagarnath Jee Temple, East Math, Village - Jehanabad Kudra, P.S. - Kudra, District - Kaimur a Bhabhua.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Jitendra Prasad Singh, Sr. Adv Mr. Varun Krishna Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.S.S. Prasad- Sc10

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

7 18-02-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for setting aside the order dated 05-01-2015 passed by Bihar Land Tribunal, Patna in B.L.T. Case No. 274 of 2014 by which, the case filed by the petitioners before the Tribunal against the order passed by the Additional Collector, Kaimur at Bhabua dated 30-12-2013 in Mutation Revision Case has been dismissed affirming the order of Deputy Collector, Land Reforms dated 10-10-2013.



3. The petitioners claim the land, in dispute to be their purchased land from the lineal descendants of recorded raiyats. Their mutation application on the basis of sale deed was allowed by the Circle Officer which was subsequently set aside by the appellate authority as well as revisional authority and also by the Bihar Land Tribunal. The order of Bihar Land Tribunal rejecting the mutation application of the petitioner is impugned herein.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they are vendees from the lineal descendants of the recorded raiyat and on the basis of sale deed, their names should have been mutated in the revenue records.

5. On the otherhand, the learned counsel for the State as well as private respondents has submitted that during consolidation operation, vendor of the petitioners had filed objection under Section 10(2) of the Bihar Consolidation of Holdings and Prevention of Fragmentation Act, 1956 which was allowed upto the revisional authority but subsequently, it was set aside by the Bihar Land Tribunal. Against the order of Bihar Land Tribunal, the vendor of the petitioners filed CWJC Nos. 16509 of 2016 and 16434 of 2016. The right and title of the vendor of the petitioners is still sub judice in those two writ



petitions and fate of the mutation application shall depend thereon.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of with the observation that the order of the mutation authority shall be subject to the final outcome of those two writ petitions, as noted above.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

U			
---	--	--	--

