

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 745 of 2025

1. Devshree Chahan @ Chauhan, W/o Rajiv Kumar, R/o Beldarichak, PO & PS-Karouna, District-Jahanabad, Bihar At Present R/o Dumardaga, Sainik Colony, PO-Booty, PS-Sadar, Ranchi
2. Sushma Kumari, W/o Kavi Ranjan, R/o Dumardaga Sainik Colony, PO-Booty, PS-Sadar, Ranchi... ... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi
3. The Additional Collector, Ranchi
4. The Circle Officer, Ormanjhi, Ranchi... ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioners	: Mr. Sunil Kumar Agarwal, Advocate
For the Respondents	: Mr. Ankit Kumar, AC to SC-1

06/08.04.2025 The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of direction upon the respondent no. 4 to mutate the land in favour of the petitioners appertaining to Khata No. 86, Plot No. 1440, Mouza-Ormanjhi, District-Ranchi as, according to the petitioners, despite filing of applications, no order is being passed by the said respondent undermining the fact that they have validly purchased the same vide registered sale deeds dated 16.03.2023 from their vendor whose name was already mutated vide Mutation Case No. 3384 R27/2011-12.

2. Mr. Ankit Kumar, AC to SC-1 appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the petitioner nos. 1 and 2 had earlier preferred mutation applications before the respondent no. 4 which were registered as Mutation Case Nos. 648 R27/2024-25 and 652 R27/2024-25 respectively and the same were rejected vide orders dated 13.12.2024. Though the said orders were appealable in nature, however, instead of taking recourse of preferring appeal

before the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Ranchi, the petitioners preferred fresh applications which were registered as Mutation Case Nos. 2325 R27/2024-25 and 2324 R27/2024-25. Despite registration of the said mutation cases, the respondent no. 4 cannot pass any further order particularly because he has already rejected the petitioners' earlier applications seeking mutation of the land in question.

3. I find force in the submission of learned counsel for the respondents. Admittedly, the applications preferred by the petitioners before the respondent no. 4 seeking mutation of the respective land have already been rejected vide orders dated 13.12.2024. If the petitioners are aggrieved with the said orders, they may prefer appeal(s) before the Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Ranchi invoking Section 15 of the Bihar Tenant's Holdings (Maintenance of Records) Act, 1973. Nonetheless, the subsequent applications filed by the petitioners before the respondent no. 4 cannot be entertained by the said respondent, as he has already rejected their earlier applications filed for the same purpose.

4. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

5. The petitioners are, however, at liberty to prefer appeal(s) against the orders dated 13.12.2024 passed by the respondent no. 4 in Mutation Case Nos. 648 R27/2024-25 and 652 R27/2024-25 respectively.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

Manish