

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22122 of 2013

=====

Enamul Haque, Son Of Late Md. Yakub, Resident Of Village- Dumri Burj,
P.S. Sonepur, Dist.- Saran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Collector, Saran
2. Authorized Officer cum District Land Acquisition Officer, Saran
3. Ehsanul Haque, Son of Late Md. Yakub, Resident of Village- Dumri
Burj, P.S. Sonepur, District Saran

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjay Kumar Patel
For the Respondent nos.1&2: Mr. Kundan Bhadur Singh, SC-22
For the Respondent no.3 : Mr. Yogendra Prasad Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-08-2015

Heard the parties.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 26.08.2013 (Annexure-1) passed by the respondent Land Acquisition Officer, Saran, Chapra, whereby, after hearing the parties, the lands in question, which was subject matter of acquisition, was held to be belonging to the respondent no.3 and objection raised on behalf of the petitioner was rejected and, accordingly, award was directed to be prepared in favour of the respondent no.3.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, though has argued the matter for sometime, but he has not been able to point out any legal infirmity in the order impugned.

Learned State counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent nos.1 and 2 and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent no.3, by referring to the averments made in their

separate counter affidavits filed on behalf of the aforesaid respondents, submits that the entire claims of the petitioner vis-à-vis the respondent no.3 were taken into consideration and thereafter the impugned order was passed. The petitioner was given full opportunity to place his case before the authorized officer, but he failed to establish the claim regarding lands in question. Therefore, his claim was rejected. According to them, there is no legal infirmity in the order impugned.

After having heard the parties and on consideration of the materials available on record, this Court does not find any good ground to interfere with the impugned order dated 26.08.2013 (Annexure-1) particularly in the background that the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has not been able to point out any legal infirmity in the order impugned.

The writ petition is dismissed, but without costs.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

Arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--