HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 21358/2026
CNR: RJHC021012372026 | URN: CW / 44791U / 2026

Seema D/o Shri Shyam Lal Brahman, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Harsaura Tehsil Bansur District Kotputli Behror.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. Kamal Kant Son Of Mahavir Brahman, Resident Of Village Harsaura Tehsil Bansur District Kotputli Behror.
2. Gram Panchayat Harsaura, Panchayat Samiti Bansur Raj.
3. Pramod Son Of Mahavir Brahman, Resident Of Village Harsaura Tehsil Bansur District Kotputli Behror.
4. Mukesh Son Of Shyamlal Mahavir Brahman, Resident Of Village Harsaura Tehsil Bansur District Kotputli Behror.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Jai Raj Tantia, Adv. Mr. Piyush Tantia, Adv.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Akshay Sharma, Adv.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANAND SHARMA

Order

26/10/2026

1. Petitioner has challenged the order dated 10.09.2026 passed by Board of Revenue in revision petition filed by the respondent No.1.

2. First and foremost submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the revision petition filed by respondent No.1 against an ad interim order passed by Sub Divisional Officer was not maintainable in view of provisions of Section 84-A of Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, 1956 (for short 'the Act of 1956').

3. Learned counsel for the respondents appeared and accepted notices and submitted that since, the order passed by Sub Divisional Officer was without jurisdiction and in utter violation of provisions of law, therefore, Board of Revenue has rightly exercised its jurisdiction and has committed no illegality in passing the interim order dated 10.09.2026.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Section 84 & 84-A of the Act of 1956 are being reproduced hereunder:-

> ***"84. Power of Board to call for records and revise orders:-*** *(1) The Board may call for the record of any case of a judicial nature or connected with settlement in which no appeal lies to the Board if the court or officer by whom the case was decided appears to have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it or him by law, or to have exercise jurisdiction so vested, or to have acted in the exercise of its or his jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity, and may pass such orders in the case as it thinks fit.*
> *Section 84A - No revision in certain cases*
>
> ***84-A. - No revision in certain cases:-*** *(1) No revision shall lie against an interim order passed in any proceeding under this Act and all pending revisions against such orders shall abate on the date of commencement of the Rajasthan Revenue Laws."*

6. Bare perusal of Section 84-A would make it clear that no revision petition shall lie against interim order and shall be maintainable only against final order passed by Court below.

7. In the instant case, admittedly the impugned order is an ad interim order passed by Sub Divisional Officer during pendency of appeal, therefore, in the light of explicit provisions contained in Section 84-A of the Act of 1956, the revision petition is not maintainable.

8. Looking to the nature of the dispute, while quashing the order dated 10.09.2026 passed by the Board of Revenue, since,

being without jurisdiction, this Court deems it just and proper to direct the Sub Divisional Officer, Bansur to hear and decide the appeal filed by the petitioner on merits as well as on the question of limitation, if any, raised by respondent No.1, expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

9. The writ petition filed by the petitioner stands disposed of accordingly.

10. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(ANAND SHARMA),J

45/Jatin