IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.8185 of 2026

---

1. Ajay Kumar Ray, son of Kailash Rai, resident of village-Manodih, P.O.-Kubri, P.S. Dhanwar, District-Giridih.
2. Purushottam Kumar Ray, son of Bhagwan Ray, resident of village-Bhigodih, P.O.-Kubri, P.S. Dhanwar, District-Giridih.
3. Mukesh Kumar, son of Gaudkaran Ray, resident of village-Manodih, P.O.-Kubri, P.S. Dhanwar, District-Giridih.
4. Madhusudan Ray, son of Maheshwari Prasad Sharma, resident of village-Bhigodih, P.O.-Kubri, P.S. Dhanwar, District-Giridih.

..... Petitioners.

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Deputy Commissioner, Giridih.
2. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Giridih.
3. The Circle Officer, Giridih.
4. Gulam Rasul, son of Late Dhani Mian, resident of Makdiha, Tola-Donatand, P.O. Dhanwar, P.S. Dhanwar (Ghorthamba O.P.), District-Giridih.

..... Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioners : Mr. Rahul Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shantanu Gupta, A.C. to A.A.G.-III

Order No.02 **Date: 28.10.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 30th April, 2026 (Annexure-5 to the writ petition) passed by the Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Giridih (the respondent no.2) in Rent Fixation Case No.01 of 2026-27, whereby the rent in respect of the land appertaining to Plot Nos.662, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 1002, 896, 897 and 960, Khata No.02 Thana No.106, measuring an area of 2.55 acres, situated at Mouza-Alagdesi, District-Giridih has been directed to be fixed in favour of the respondent no.4 (the private respondent) by way of an *ex parte* proceeding.

2. Mr. Shantanu Gupta, learned A.C. to A.A.G.-III appearing on behalf of the respondent-State, at the outset, submits that the petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy of preferring a revision under Section 16 of the Bihar (now Jharkhand) Tenants' Holdings (Maintenance of Records) Act, 1973 (in short 'Act, 1973') against the impugned order dated 30th April, 2026 passed by the respondent no.2.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering that the petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy of preferring a revision against the impugned order dated 30th April, 2026 passed by the respondent no.2 under Section 16 of the Act, 1973, I am not inclined to entertain the present writ petition at this stage. The petitioner is, however, at liberty to take the recourse of preferring revision against the said order passed by the respondent no.2.

4. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with aforesaid liberty.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

Rohit/
28.10.2026
Uploaded on 28.10.2026