IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.5553 of 2018
------

1. Shyam Oraon, son of Bhikha Oraon, resident of Near Railway Crossing, Shantipur, Dibadih, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, District Ranchi.
2. Somnath Oraon, son of Bhikha Oraon, resident of Village Nagra, P.O. & P.S. Nagra, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand.
3. Bibudh Bahadur Bhagat, son of Bhikha Oraon, resident of Nagra, P.O. & P.S. Nagra, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand.

... ... Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand, through Secretary, Department of Land Reforms, Revenue and Registration, Government of Jharkhand, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, District Ranchi.
2. Deputy Commissioner, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S. Lohardaga, District Lohardaga.
3. Additional Collector, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S. Lohardaga, District Lohardaga.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S. Lohardaga, District Lohardaga.
5. Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S. Lohardaga, District Lohardaga.
6. Circle Officer, Kairo, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S. Lohardaga, District Lohardaga.
7. The Villagers of Village Nagra, P.O. & P.S. Nagra, District Lohardaga, Jharkhand.

... ... Respondents

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Neerad Jaiswal, Advocate
Mr. Tarun Kr. Mahato, Advocate
Mr. Roshan Kr. Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Ankit Kumar, AC to GP-VI
Mrs. Sunita Kumari, AC to Sr. SC-II
Md. Razaullah Ansari, Advocate

16/ 14.09.2026

By filing this writ petition, the petitioners have prayed for the following reliefs:-

> *"i. In the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 07.08.2018 (Annexure-6) passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Lohardaga in Misc. T. R. No. 1/18-19 in terms of which the*

settlement of 18 decimals of land comprised in Khata no. 136, Plot No.785, of Village Nagra, made in favour of the father of the petitioners has been cancelled on wholly erroneous grounds;

ii. Upon quashing the order dated 07.08.2018 (Annexure-6) passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Lohardaga in Misc. T.R. No.1/18-19 be further pleased to direct the respondents to restore the settlement validity made in favour father of the petitioners;"

2. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioners and learned counsel representing the respondents.

3. The petitioners in this writ petition have challenged the decision of the Deputy Commissioner, Lohardaga, cancelling the settlement over the land in question, made in favour of father of the petitioners.

4. From the impugned order, it is clear that the respondents have annulled the settlement in favour of father of the petitioners, on the ground that site inspection report indicates that there is no actual possession over the land in question and the said land was recorded in the continuous *Khatiyan,* as *Gair Mazarua Aam*, and settlement over the said land in the name of any individual person appears to be contrary to the Rules, as the land was being used for public purposes, specifically for the ritual purification of the body following cremation and also serves as a religious site for the villagers.

5. The respondent-State have admitted that 18 decimals of land was settled in favour of father of the petitioners vide

Settlement Case No.07/2004-05.

6. After hearing the parties and going through the records of this case, I find that since admittedly father of the petitioners was settled with 18 decimals of land by the respondents and on the other hand, the respondents themselves have come to a conclusion that as the land used for religious purpose, the same could not have been settled, thus, I am not inclined to interfere in the impugned order.

6.1. The respondents are directed to find out an alternative 18 decimals of land, which can be settled in favour of the petitioners.

7. With the aforesaid observations and directions, this Writ Petition stands **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

14th September, 2026
Prashant.Cp-2

Uploaded on 18.09.2026