

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13965 of 2021

=====

Tarkeshwar Singh Son of Late Birendra Singh, Resident of Village-Kuwarpur,
P.S.-Pipra, District-East Champaran, Motihari.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reform Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reform Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector/District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
4. The Addl. Collector, East Champaran, Motihari.
5. The Anchaladhikari, Chakia, District-East Champaran, Motihari.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raj Kishore Roy (Gp18)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 13-03-2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. This writ application has been filed for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for direction of respondents to consider the application dated 16.07.2021 and 23.07.2021 filed by the petitioner for mutation of his name over the land of the petitioner and further for issuance of direction to the respondents to consider the application of the petitioner and upon mutation create the Jamabandi in the name of the petitioner and to further give other legal consequential benefits to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the petitioner had approached this Court for a direction to



the respondent-authorities to upon the Jamabandi in the name of the petitioner with respect to the said land. It has been fairly submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the counter affidavit filed on behalf of respondents no. 3 to 5 suggests that during the pendency of this application the final order with respect to the mutation application has been passed on 18.08.2021 and the same has been brought on record by way of Annexure-B.

4. The learned AC to GP-18 submits that from perusal of Annexure-B, it would be evident that the application for mutation has been dismissed on the ground that there is a suit pending bearing Title Suit No. 465 of 2014. It has been submitted that in view of the statutory provisions that no application would be maintainable as per Section 6(12) of the Bihar Land Mutation Act, 2011 during the pendency of a suit, the present application is misconceived.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the fact that the application initially was filed for a direction for passing orders in the application filed by the petitioner and in view of the final order having been passed rejecting the application, the present application has lost its effect.



6. In view of the specific provisions of law, no further order is required to be passed especially for the fact that the application filed by the petitioner has already been disposed of.

7. In view of the above, the present application has become infructuous for the present.

8. The application stands disposed of accordingly.

9. The petitioner has the liberty to move before the appropriate authority ones the Title Suit No. 465 of 2014 is disposed of.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

krishna/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	13.03.2026
Transmission Date	

