

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

WP(C) No.1578 of 2026

Madia Devi, aged about 59 years, wife of Sri Bishwa Tirkey,
resident of Hatia, PO: Hatia, PS: Jagarnathpur, District-Ranchi

... Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO: Ranchi GPO, PS: Kotwali, District-Ranchi
3. Land Reforms Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, PO: Ranchi GPO, PS: Kotwali, District-Ranchi
4. Circle Officer, Namkum, PO & PS: Namkum, District-Ranchi
5. Jalhi Orain, widow of Late Sukra Oraon, resident of Jagarnathpur, Lal Koncha, PO: Hatia, PS: Jagarnathpur, District-Ranchi
6. Sonu Kachhap, son of Late Sukra Oraon, resident of Hatia, PO: Hatia, PS: Jagarnathpur, District-Ranchi **... Respondent(s).**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. A. K. Sahani, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Manoj Kumar, GA-III

.....

02 /17.03.2026: Heard the learned counsel representing the petitioner and the learned counsel representing the respondents.

2. The petitioner by filing this writ petition has prayed to quash Annexure-4 which is an order dated 24.12.2025 passed by the Revisional Authority in Mutation Revision Case No. 13 R-15 of 2023-24 whereby the appeal filed by the respondent nos. 5 and 6 was interfered with but to a limited extent that the jamabandi will be in the name of common ancestor of this petitioner till disposal of the Civil Suit which should be filed by the aggrieved parties.

3. After going through the records, I find that the dispute is in respect of right, title and interest over the property. The petitioner

claims to be the descendant of the recorded tenant and claims mutation of the property. The mutation was allowed but after a considerable period of time the private respondents challenged the same.

4. Be it noted that the private respondents also claim to be the heirs of the deceased land owner raiyat.

5. In the impugned order, the Revisional Authority has held that the dispute can be adjudicated by the Civil Court of competent jurisdiction, thus, directed the parties to approach the appropriate Civil Court. The Revisional Authority further held that till the Civil Court takes a decision on the issue, the jamabandi would be maintained in the name of Chhedi Oraon, the deceased ancestor. The limited grievance of the petitioner is that since the jamabandi was running in the name of this petitioner, the Revisional Authority could not have directed to maintain the jamabandi in the name of the deceased original raiyat.

6. Be that as it may, from the records and from the nature of dispute, I find that there is dispute of right, title and interest over the property, between two private parties who are alleged to be agnates. Both of them are claiming right over the property in question. The Revisional Authority thus has correctly directed the parties to approach the appropriate Civil Court for declaration of right, title and interest of the property.

7. During the intervening period the Revisional Authority had only by way of interim measure directed that the revenue records to

be maintained in the name of original raiyat. I find no illegality in it. This is an interim arrangement made by the Revisional Authority which is subject to the final decision of the civil suit if filed.

8. Thus, I am not inclined to interfere with the direction given in the impugned order by the Revisional Authority. The petitioner if so advised may file a civil suit for declaration of right, title and interest and possession over the property in question.

9. The final order of mutation will depend upon the decree passed by the Civil Court.

10. It is made clear that the Civil Court will not be prejudiced by any of the finding or observation in the orders passed by the Revenue Authorities.

11. Accordingly, this writ petition is **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

17.03.2026
Tanuj/CP-2

Uploaded on 19.03.2026