IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3868 of 2013

Laxuman Yadav S/O - Late Bacha Yadav, Resident of Village - Hulas, Tola - Bichari, P.O. - Hulas, P.S. - Raghopur, District - Supaul.

.... PETITIONER

Versus

- 1. The State of Bihar through the Collector Supaul, District Supaul.
- 2. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector Veerpur, District Supaul.
- 3. The Anchaladhikari (Raghopur Anchal) at Raghopur, District Supaul.
 - 4. Umesh Yadav, S/O Late Kushum Lal Yadav
- 5. Brahmadeo Yadav, S/O Late Anand Yadav.
 Both R/O Village Hulas, Tola Banarjhula, P.O. Hulas, P.S.
 Raghopur, District Supaul.
- 6. Kapileshwar Mehta S/O Ganga Mehta, R/O Village Barmotar, P.O. Hulas, P.S. Raghopur, District Supaul.

.... RESPONDENTS

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR ORAL ORDER

2. 28-02-2013

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Rajeev Kumar Singh, learned A.C. to Government Advocate No. 8.

In the present petition, the petitioner has directly approached to the writ court, with a prayer to quash an order passed by the Circle Officer, Raghopur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner orally submits that direction may be given for demarcating the land of the

petitioner and also set aside the communication contained in **Annexure – '3'** to the writ petition.

On perusal of the **Annexure – '3'**, it appears that the Revenue Clerk had submitted a report to the Circle Officer, disclosing therein that on disputed land, the petitioner was not in possession, but it was underpossession of some other person. The Revenue Clerk had also reported that such dispute can be adjudicated by the competent court of jurisdiction.

On perusal of **Annexure – '3'** to the writ petition, the Court is of the opinion that such dispute can not be resolved by the writ court.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

