2026:JHHC:29847

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P. (C) No. 7770 of 2026

Shivnarayan Prasad Sahu, son of Govind Saw, resident of Village- Ara, P.O.- Ganeshpur, P.S.- Balumath, District- Latehar

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand represented through the Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Latehar
3. The Circle Officer, Balumath, District- Latehar

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
Ms. Chhaya Kumari Dubey, Advocate
Mr. Chandra S. Pandey, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Aditya Raman, A.C. to G.A.-III

Order No. 02 **Dated: 06.10.2026**

1. The present writ petition has been filed for issuance of direction upon the respondent no. 3- the Circle Officer, Balumath, District- Latehar, to take appropriate decision on the petitioner's application (Annexure-4 to the writ petition) seeking issuance of online rent receipt with respect to the lands situated at Mouza- Ara, P.S. No. 55, Khata no. 175, plot nos. 321 and 440 measuring an area of 2.50 acres and 47 decimals respectively (total 2.97 acres) in view of the order dated 07.11.2008 passed by the Revenue Officer, Latehar in Revenue Case No. 3048 of 1990.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, his father – Govind Sao (since deceased), mother- Yashoda Devi and others preferred a case under Section 87 of the Chota

Nagpur Tenancy Act, 1908 in the Court of Revenue Officer, Latehar against the State of Bihar (now the State of Jharkhand) which was registered as Revenue Case No. 3048 of 1990. The said case was allowed in favour of the petitioner and others vide order dated 07.11.2008. Despite having succeeded in the said case, appropriate correction in the revenue record with respect to the lands in question has not been done by the respondent authorities. The rent for the said lands is also not being accepted. Aggrieved with the said situation, the petitioner represented the respondent no.3 which was received in the office of the said respondent on 28.02.2026. However, since no action is being taken by the respondent no. 3 on the said representation, the petitioner has been compelled to prefer the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Aditya Raman, learned A.C. to G.A.-III appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the aforesaid claim of the petitioner is required to be examined by the competent authority i.e., the respondent no. 3. Hence, if the petitioner prefers a fresh representation on the present issue before the respondent no. 3, an appropriate order will be passed by the said respondent in accordance with law.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of prayer made in the present writ petition, without entering into the merit of the case, the petitioner is given liberty to prefer a fresh representation on the present issue

before the respondent no. 3. On receipt of the said representation, the respondent no. 3, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as other concerned person(s), if so required, and on examining the relevant records, shall take an appropriate informed decision within three months from the date of filing of the said representation.

5. The writ petition is disposed of with aforesaid liberty and direction.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

October 06, 2026
Ritesh/
Uploaded on 06.10.2026