



1

WP-20331-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VISHAL MISHRA

ON THE 25th OF JUNE, 2025WRIT PETITION No. 20331 of 2025*ANURUDDHA SHRIVASTAV**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

*Shri H.K. Golhani - Advocate for the petitioner.**Shri Suyash Thakur - Government Advocate for the respondents/State.*
.....

ORDER

This petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India has been filed seeking following reliefs:-

- a) Issue a writ of *mandamus*, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction, commanding the Respondents to decide the petitioner's mutation application dated 29.03.2025 within a stipulated time frame as fixed by this Hon'ble Court.
- b) Direct the Respondent No. 4 to mutate the name of the petitioner in the revenue records with respect to land bearing Khasra No. 1073, admeasuring 0.3325 hectares, situated at MojaShehpura, Tehsil and District Sagar, Madhya Pradesh.
- c) Direct the respondent no. 3 to conduct an enquiry against the respondent no. 4 for illegal demand of bribe from the petitioner.
- d) Grant any other relief(s), order(s), or direction(s) that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, proper, and in the interest of justice.

2. After arguing at length, learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn attention of this Court to the complaint (Annexure-P/3) made to the Commissioner, Sagar Division Sagar regarding demand of Rs.20,000/- being



made by the Patwari. The relevant portion of the complaint is as under:-

"3 वर्तमान में पदस्थ हल्का 107 पटवारी श्री राम सागर तिवारी उप तहसील शाहपुर तहसील व जिला सागर से मैंने कई बार संपर्क किया एवं नामांतरण बटवारे से संबंधित समस्मत दस्तावेज उपलब्ध कराये। इसके उपरान्त दिनांक 08.05.2025 को मेरी उनसे बात होने पर कहा गया कि नामांतरण एवं बटवारे के बीस हजार रुपये देना होंगे तभी हो पायेगा चाहे आप प्रधानमंत्री के यहां क्यों न चले जाओ।"

3. From the perusal of aforesaid, it is clear that there are specific allegations regarding corruption and illegal demand made by Patwari.
4. It is submitted by the counsel for the petitioner that as he is unable to fulfill the illegal demand, his case is kept pending. He prayed that his application may be treated as complaint to Lokayukt department and he may be directed to act on such a complaint.
5. Under these circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to relegate the matter to the Lokayukta for taking appropriate action on the complaint (Annexure-P/3) made by the petitioner.
6. Accordingly, the matter is relegated to the Lokayukta to take appropriate action on the complaint (Annexure-P/3) made by the petitioner treating it to be a complaint made by the petitioner to the Lokayukta department.
7. With aforesaid observations, the petition stands **disposed of**.

(VISHAL MISHRA)
JUDGE