GAHC010214042025

2026:GAU-AS:16332

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/5740/2025

MD. RAJIK ALI
S/O- LATE TACHER ALI.
VILL.- CHAYANI MANIARI, MOUZA- CHAYANI, CIRCLE- PALASHBARI,
DIST.- KAMRUP, ASSAM

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND ORS
REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY, LAND AND REVENUE DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM, DISPUR, GUWAHATI-06.

2:THE DIRECTOR OF REVENUE AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT
(REFORMS)
GUWAHATI-06.

3:THE DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
KAMRUP
KAMRUP AT AMINGAON
PIN - 781031.

4:THE CIRCLE OFFICER
PALASHBARI REVENUE CIRCLE
P.O. AND P.S.- PALASHBARI
DIST.- KAMRUP
ASSAM
PIN - 781028

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A R BHUYAN, S. AHMED,MR. A ALI

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM, SC, REVENUE

BEFORE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

ORDER

06-11-2026

1. Heard Mr. A. Ali, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. B.J.Talukdar, learned Senior Government Advocate, Assam for the respondents.

2. The grievance raised in this petition is that by ignoring the absolute ownership of the petitioner over a plot of land measuring 5 Bighas 3 Kathas covered by Dag No. 45 under K.P. patta No. 26, situated at Revenue Village-Chayani Maniari, which was purchased by the petitioner by a registered sale deed, the respondent revenue authorities incorporated the name of a 3rd party in the revenue record. Accordingly, the petitioner filed an online application for deletion of the name of the 3rd party from the revenue record.

3. Alleging that such application was not proceeded with, the present petition has been filed.

4. Mr. B.J.Talukdar, learned Senior State counsel representing the State respondents submits that after filing of the application on 03.10.2023, the same was forwarded to the Assistant Settlement Officer; on the same day, it was forwarded to the Circle Officer, and subsequently, on 30.12.2023 it was sent to the Lot Mandal and then to the Sadar Kanango. After receipt of the report on 20.06.2024, the claim was rejected on 24.06.2024, on the ground that the persons whose names were recorded, had objected to the claim of the petitioner during the hearing. Thus, the aforesaid

proceeding has duly been concluded.

5. However, what is noticed is that the final order states "as the second party has objected during the hearing that his/her name should not be struck off, the application is rejected."

6. This Court is of the opinion that such an application cannot be decided in a single line order. However, Mr. Talukdar, learned Senior State counsel submits that the same is the uploaded version of the operative portion of the order and the reasoned order shall be available in the record.

7. That being the position, the concerned Circle Officer is directed to provide the order dated 24.06.2024 by the Circle Officer rejecting the application of the petitioner, inasmuch as, until and unless such reasoned order is provided to the petitioner, the petitioner cannot approach the Appellate Authority to challenge such order.

8. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event, such an application is filed by the petitioner seeking a copy of the order dated 24.06.2024, the same be provided by the concerned Circle Officer to him within a period of 7 days from the date of receipt of such application.

9. With the aforesaid, the instant writ petition stands disposed of.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant