SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMS/2606/2015 Bharat Singh --Petitioner **Versus** Additional Commissioner,kumaon Mandal,nainital. --Respondent **Hon'ble Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J** 1. Mr. Arvind Vashisth, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Ghanshyam Joshi, learned Additional C.S.C. for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. Mr. Rajesh Pandey, learned counsel for respondent no. 2. 4. Petitioners have challenged order dated 30.05.2015 passed by Additional Commissioner, Kumaon in Revision No. 88/2010-11/69/12-13. 5. Learned State Counsel vehemently argued that the impugned order has been passed in mutation proceedings, as the Tehsildar concerned had allowed the mutation application based on false claim of succession made by the petitioners. He submits that petitioners are imposters and they have nothing to do with original tenure holder, namely, Smt. Jhankaiya, but they presented themselves to be descendant of Smt. Jhankaiya. 6. This Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned judgment and order passed by Additional

			Commissioner. 7. Law is well settled that mutation of name in revenue record does not create any right, title or interest over the property nor deletion of name from revenue record extinguishes such right. Mutation is done only for fiscal purpose i.e collection of land revenue. If petitioners have any right, title or interest over the land in question, then they are free to seek declaration of that right by filing a declaratory suit under Section 229B of UPAZ&LR Act. The observation, if any, made by revisional court will not come in their way in view of provisions contained in Section 40-A of Uttarakhand Land Revenue Act, 1901. 8. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is disposed of. **(Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J)** 24.08.2026 Aswal