

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3882 of 2026

1. Uma Shankar Prasad Son of Late Mishri Mahto Resident of Khemhichak, P.O.- New Jaganpura, P.S.- Ramkrishnanagar, District- Patna.
2. Ramashish Mahto, Son of Late Mishri Mahto Resident of Khemhichak, P.O.- New Jaganpura, P.S.- Ramkrishnanagar, District- Patna.
3. Shakaldeo Mahto, Son of Late Mishri Mahto Resident of Khemhichak, P.O.- New Jaganpura, P.S.- Ramkrishnanagar, District- Patna.
4. Yogendra Mahto, Son of Late Mishri Mahto Resident of Khemhichak, P.O.- New Jaganpura, P.S.- Ramkrishnanagar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Circle Officer, Patna City, District- Patna.
3. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Patna City, District- Patna.
4. The Deputy Collector of Land Reforms (D.C.L.R.), Patna City, District- Patna.
5. The Station House Officer, Agamkuan Police Station, Patna.
6. Ramchandrareshwar Mahto, Son of Late Ganga Mahto Resident of Bari Pahari, P.S.- Agam Kuan, Town and District- Patna.
7. Rajaram Mahto, Son of Shyama Mahto Resident of Bari Pahari, P.S.- Agam Kuan, Town and District- Patna.
8. Rajballabh Mahto, Son of Shyama Mahto Resident of Bari Pahari, P.S.- Agam Kuan, Town and District- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amaresh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
	:	Mr. Pankaj Mijorwar, Advocate
	:	Ms. Deeksha, Advocate
	:	Mr. Akshat Sinha, Advocate
	:	Mr. Nagadeo Choubey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Archana Meenakshee, GP-6
	:	Mr. Rana Veer Prawar, AC to GP-6

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 31-03-2026 Heard Mr. Pankaj Mijorwar, learned counsel for the

petitioners and Mr. Archana Meenakshee, learned GP-6

representing the State.



2. The present petition has been preferred:

“against the arbitrary, illegal, and malafide actions of the Respondent No. 2, the Circle Officer, Patna City, and the consequential criminal acts of the private respondents, coupled with the complete inaction of the police authorities (Respondent No. 5).”

3. The petitioners contend that a Title Suit No. 222 of 2002 is pending before a competent court of learned Sub-Judge, Patna and the parties are contesting there. Further, submission is that so far as the ‘Baksisnama’ is concerned, it has been stamped by successive Courts including the Hon’ble Apex Court against the respondents but still they are putting spoke in the wheels instead of pursuing the case/Title Suit.

4. The submission is that neither the Title Suit is being concluded nor they are being allowed to live in peace and this led them to file present writ petition.

5. Learned State counsel submits that a Title Suit is pending and all these facts should have been brought before the competent Civil Court.

6. This Court is in conformity with the submission put forward by the learned State counsel, however, since the



petitioner has brought on record number of documents to show his bonafide as also the attitude of the respondents, without commenting further, this Court would appreciate if the competent court where the Title Suit No. 222 of 2002 is pending, expedites the case and conclude the same without unnecessary delay preferably within a period of one year.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

