

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20795 of 2021

=====

Md. Niyaz S/o Md. Khalil Uddin @ Md. Khalil Residing at House No. J/129,
P.C. Colony, Kankarbagh, Police Station- Kankarbagh, District- Patna,
Permanent resident of Village- Khureshan Police Station- Salkhua, District-
Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Revenue Dept. Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector, Saharsa.
3. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Saharsa.
4. The Circle Officer Wanama Itahari, District Saharsa.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Sajid Salim Khan (Sc25)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 20-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has filed the present writ for a writ of mandamus commanding the respondent authorities to mutate the lands in the name of the petitioner as per order for the Revenue Officer, Saharsa passed in Case No. 4522 of 1985, Case No. 4523 of 1985 and Case No. 7527 of 1985 as contained in Annexure 1, 2



and 3. The counsel further submits that the plots are mentioned in Annexure 1, 2 and 3 but the petitioner's name was not entered in Government Sirista which led to filling of cases, in the Court of Revenue Officer, Saharsa. As per the petitioner, the Revenue Officer, Saharsa found the claim of the petitioner genuine and directed the officer to mutate the name of the petitioner in government records by his order dated 18.06.2004, 21.05.2004 & 21.05.2004.

3. The specific submission of the petitioner is that spite to these orders, authorities concerned are not mutating the land of the petitioner.

4. As per the counter affidavit of the State in paragraph 8 & 9, the department initiated proceedings against Revenue Officer R.P. Srivastava and Md. Riyazuddin Ahmad ASO (Q), Saharsa and after concluding departmental proceedings, Riyazuddin Ahmad was dismissed and the FIR was also lodged against the Revenue Officers.

5. Taking note of the fact that the department has initiated proceedings against the persons who had passed the antedated order, I am not inclined to interfere in the present writ petition.

6. In view of the facts, the present writ petition is



dismissed.

(Alok Kumar, J)

Anand/-

U			
---	--	--	--

