

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5165 of 2026

=====

Rahmila Devi Wife of Late Naresh Singh, Resident of Villzage-Panghara,
Police Station-Ramgarh Chowk, District-Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Lakhisarai.
3. The Additional District Magistrate, Lakhisarai.
4. The Circle Officer, Lakhisarai.
5. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Lakhisarai.
6. Vinay Kumar, son of Mathura Singh, Resident of Villzage-Panghara, Police Station-Ramgarh Chowk, District-Lakhisarai.
7. Shakuntala Devi, Wife of Late Muso Shah, Resident of Village-Kabaiya Road, Ward No. 22, Naya Bazar, Police Station-Kawaiya, District-Lakhisarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bipin Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Sudhanshu Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sita Ram Yadav, GP-16
	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava, SC to GP-16

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 13-07-2026 Heard Mr. Bipin Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner duly assisted by Mr. Sudhanshu Kumar and learned

State counsel.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the

grant of following relief(s):

“(i) for issuance of writ/writs in the



nature of certiorari for setting aside the order dated 27.01.2026 passed by the Learned Additional District Magistrate, Lakhisarai in Mutation Revision No. 7 of 2025-26, whereby and where under the learned court pleased to set aside the order dated 25.03.2025 passed by the Learned Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Lakhisarai in Mutation Appeal No. 645 of 2023-24.

(ii) for commanding the respondents as to why the order passed by the Learned Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Lakhisarai on 25.03.2025 has been set aside without going the real facts of this case.

(iii) for commanding the respondents to immediately restore the real partition of land in question in favour of the petitioner.

(iv) for commanding the respondents as to why the order dated 27.01.2026 has been passed in favour of the respondent no. 6 though the petitioner is real owner of the land in question.



(v) for commanding the respondents as to why the mutation order of the Learned Circle Officer has been ignored and passing the order in favour of the respondent no. 5.

(vi) for commanding the respondent to immediately pass order in favour of the petitioner.

(vii) for any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order dated 27.01.2026 passed by the Additional District Magistrate, Lakhisarai as the Bihar Land Tribunal (henceforth for short ‘the Tribunal’) was not functioning.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that now ‘the Tribunal’ is functioning and the petitioner has a forum where he can agitate the matter.

5. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of allowing the petitioner to challenge the order in question before ‘the Tribunal’ and in case, such petition is preferred in next four weeks, ‘the Tribunal’ shall take into account the fact that the



writ petition was pending before this Court while dealing with the limitation petition.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

