

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6152 of 2015

=====

Deo Narayan Mahto, Son of Late Ram Tahal Mahto, resident of village-
Piprauliya, P.S.- Jhanjharpur, O.P- Araria Sangram, Distt.- Madhubani
(Bihar).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The National Highway Authority of India, through its Chairman NHAI,
New Delhi.
2. The Project Director, NHAI, Darbhanga.
3. The Arbitrator, N.H-57 Project cum Additional collector, Madhubani,
Distt- Madhubani.
4. The Competent Authority N.H-57 Project Cum District Land Acquisition
Officer, Madhubani, District Madhubani.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Nath Jha
For the Respondent nos.1&2: Mr. Sunil Kumar-II
Mr.Ranjan Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-08-2015

Heard.

The simple grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition is that he filed a petition vide Annexure-2 before the respondent no.3, the arbitrator, appointed by the Central Government under the provisions of The National Highways Act, 1956 (in short 'Act, 1956') for redressal of his valid grievances in terms of Section 3G(5) of the Act, 1956, which gave rise to the Case No.17 of 2011-12, but, despite passage of more than four years, the matter has not been finally disposed of by the respondent no.3 and valid grievances of the petitioner have not been redressed.

In above view of the matter, the petitioner is directed to appear before the respondent no.3 with a certified copy of the present order and all other relevant documents in support of his

claims within a period of one month from today before the respondent no.3, whereafter the respondent no.3 shall make all endeavours to dispose of the aforesaid Case No.17 of 2011-12, after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned, by a reasoned and speaking order, at an early date, preferably within a period of three months from the date of appearance of the petitioner.

The petitioner shall be at liberty to raise all the issues of facts and law, which may be available to him.

It is clarified that this Court has not gone into the merits of the claims of the petitioner with respect to the lands in question and the same is left to be decided by the respondent no.3 in accordance with law.

The writ petition stands finally disposed of with the observations and directions made above.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--