

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13137 of 2025

-
1. Om Prakash Sinha Son of Late Yogendra Prasad Sinha @ Yogendra Kumar Sinha, Resident of Village- Lodipur, P.S.- Chainpur, P.O.- Amaon, District- Kaimur, Bhabhua, at Present Bhabhua, Ward No.- 3, behind Central Co-operative Bank, P.S.- Bhabhua, District- Kaimur.
 2. Rajan Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Yogendra Prasad Sinha @ Yogendra Kumar Sinha, Resident of Village- Lodipur, P.S.- Chainpur, P.O.- Amaon, District- Kaimur, Bhabhua, at Present Bhabhua, Ward No.- 3, behind Central Co-operative Bank, P.S.- Bhabhua, District- Kaimur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector-cum- District Magistrate, Kaimur, Bhabhua.
4. The Sub- Divisional Magistrate, Sadar, Bhabhua.
5. The Circle Officer, Chainpur, Kaimur (Bhabhua).

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Srivastva, Advocate
For the State	:	Md. Harun Quareshi, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel appearing for the respondent-State.

2. The petitioners in the present writ application has
prayed for the grant of following reliefs:

*(i) For issuance of an
appropriate writ, order or direction in
the nature of mandamus directing the
respondent authorities to mutate the
name of the petitioners over the land in
question and also grant revenue
receipts in their name over which the*



petitioners have got valid Right, Title and possession since long.

(ii) For issuance of a further writ/order or direction to the respondent authorities not to interfere in the peaceful possession of the land in question of the petitioners and to prevent them from taking forceful possession illegally over the land in question and also not to settle the same in favour of anybody else and also not to change the nature of the land in question without any order of the Competent Court.

(iii) For issuance of any other appropriate writ, order or direction to which the petitioner may be found entitled in the eye of law.

3. In paragraph 13 of the writ application, the petitioners have stated that the petitioners have filed a petition before the Circle Officer, Chainpur, Kaimur for mutating their name but it was refused by the Circle Officer by an order dated 17.02.2023 passed in Mutation Case No. 2843R27/2022-2023/Chainpur (Annexure P6). The statement made in paragraph 13 of the writ application made in this regard is quoted hereinbelow:

That in the light of the aforesaid judgment dated 25.03.2014 in T.S. No.



227/2003 of the Competent Court and order passed by Consolidation Officer in Case No. 141/82-83 and 240/90-91 the petitioner again filed a petition before C.O. Chainpur, Kaimur for mutating their name but it was refused by the Circle Officer by an order dated 17.02.2023 in Mutation Case No. 2843R27/2022-2023/ Chainpur.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the aforesaid order passed by the Circle Officer, Chainpur refusing to mutate the names of the petitioners were challengeable before DCLR, Kaimur, Bhabhua but the same has not been done by the petitioners.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondent-State submits that the order dated 17.02.2023 passed by the Circle Officer (Annexure P6) refusing to mutate the names of the petitioners have not been challenged in the present writ application and neither the said order has been challenged before the DCLR, Kaimur. In such view of the matter, as per learned counsel appearing for respondent-State, the present writ application is misconceived and, therefore, fit to be dismissed.

6. The petitioners have themselves admitted that they had filed a petition before the Circle Officer, Chainpur, Kaimur for mutating their names which was refused by the Circle



Officer by order dated 17.02.2023 (Annexure P6) and the said order has not been challenged by the petitioners. It is also not in dispute that the order passed by the Circle Officer, Chainpur, Kaimur has also not been challenged before the DCLR, Kaimur.

7. Under the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present writ application is misconceived and, therefore, rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Raj Ranjan/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

