

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8070 of 2026

=====

Kamlesh Prasad, Son of Shyam Narayan Bind, resident of village- Jhikhateya,
P.O.- Rukunde, P.S.- Bimdeya, Anchal Goh, Anumandal, Daudnagar, District-
Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Revenue and Land Reforms Dept, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Commissioner, Magadh Parmandal, Gaya Ji, Bihar.
3. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad (Bihar).
4. The Additional Collector, Aurangabad, Bihar.
5. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms (DCLR), Aurangabad, Bihar.
6. The Sub Divisional Magistrate, (SDM), Aurangabad (Bihar).
7. The Circle Officer, Goh, Aurangabad, Bihar.
8. The Ramodhar Singh, Son of Raghu Raj Singh, resident of village- Rukunde P.S.- Bimdeya, Anchal Goh, Anumandal, Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad (Bihar).

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kedar Yadav, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Harun Quareshi, AC to SC-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANA VIKRAM SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 01-07-2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court with



misconceived reliefs, which cannot be granted under writ jurisdiction exercising powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

3. The petitioner has raised the question of creation of *Jamabandi* in his name through the direction issued by the writ Court to the Circle Officer, Goh, Aurangabad without having approached the Circle Officer previously on any occasion to get the land mutated in his name for creation of *Jamabandi*. The petitioner has also, in alternative, prayed for giving him possession over the land in question, the details of which are as follows:

“Area 8 decimal, Khata No. 38, Plot No. 1115, North Road (Chawar), South-Sri Ram Bind, East-Sona Devi, West-Sakaldeep Sharma and others”.

4. It appears that without availing the proper remedy, either before the Circle Officer/D.C.L.R., for recovery of possession in terms of Section 4 of the Bihar Land Disputes Resolution Act, 2009 or else without having approached the Civil Court of competent jurisdiction for getting the title decided, the petitioner has approached this Court directly with the prayer to decide the possession as well as creation of *Jamabandi* in his favour.



5. At this stage, the learned counsel for the State very fairly submits that the writ application being wholly misconceived, is fit to be dismissed *in limine*.

6. After having heard the learned counsel for the parties at length and having gone through the documents brought on record, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner, under misconceived notion, has availed the wrong forum under the writ jurisdiction as this Court cannot entertain and decide the issue relating to disputed question of facts.

7. In this backdrop, this application is disposed off with a liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority under appropriate proceeding for getting the reliefs, which he sought to claim in the present writ application.

8. The writ application stands disposed off.

9. Interlocutory application(s), if any, also stands disposed off accordingly.

(Rana Vikram Singh, J)

Praveen-II/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	02.07.2026
Transmission Date	N/A

