

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.555 of 2026

-
1. Pintu Kumar
 2. Gauri Sanker Kumar,
Both are Sons of Satyendra Prasad @ Satyendra Yadav @ Satyendra Kumar,
Resident of Village-Bahwalpur, P.O.-Takya Karpi, Hulashganj, PS-Mahkar,
District-Gaya at Present resident of Village-Dhansingra Tola, Khokhnachak,
P.O.-Dhansingra, P.S.-Mahkar, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its The Principal Secretary Revenue Department,
Patna, Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
3. The Additional District Magistrate, Land Reforms, Gaya.
4. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Neemchak Bathani.
5. The DCLR, Neemchak Bathani.
6. The Circle Officer, Khizarsarai.
7. Sanjeet Kumar Singh, Son of Late Rajnandan Yadav, Resident of Village-
Shyam Nagar, Post Office-Dhansingra, Police Station -Mahkar, District-
Gaya.
8. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Son of Late Rajnandan Yadav, Resident of Village-
Shyam Nagar, Post Office-Dhansingra, Police Station-Mahkar, District-
Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Prakash Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sajid Salim Khan, SC 25

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 27-01-2026 Heard Mr. Ram Prakash Kumar, learned counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Mr. Sajid Salim

 Khan, learned SC 25 for the State.

2. Petitioners have *inter alia* prayed for following
reliefs in the paragraphs No.1 of the writ petition:-

“1. For quashing the order dated 13.12.2025



passed by the Court of Additional Collector, Gaya in Mutation Revision No.04/2024-25 Sanjeet Kumar Singh & Others Versus LRDC Neemchak Bathani & Others Pintu Kumar & Gauri Sanker Kumar, both are son of Satyendra Prasad @ Satyendra Yadav @ Satyendra Kumar by which the petitioners and other have been directed to present along with documents for the land of RS Plot No.724 under RS Khata No.105 Area 1.11 Acre of Mauza Dhan Singhara Thana No.25 Anchal Khizarsarai District Gaya.

II. For restraining the respondents including the private respondents from interfering with the peaceful possession of the petitioners and/or his family members over the land in question.

III. For any relief(s) for which the petitioners are deemed to be entitled in the eye of law.”

3. Considering the nature of relief as sought for in the present writ petition and considering the fact that petitioners have claimed that they have been deprived of their rightful possession and title over the property in question, having purchased from the vendor / Rajali Devi, who is own family member of the petitioners and subsequently, according to the petitioners, she has sold the land to the private respondents no.7 and 8 and the said Rajali Devi having not been made party in the present writ petition, I find that the petitioners can either resolve their dispute amicably by way of mediation or in alternative, can also avail remedy before competent civil court having jurisdiction to get the registered sale deed declared void, by which they are aggrieved.

4. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

5. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, also stands



disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

