

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5278 of 2014

=====

1. Vijay Chaudhary Son Of Sigashan Resident Of Village And Police Station-
Karamchat, District- Bhabua

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Water Resources Sichaiee Bhawan,
Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Land Acquisition and Rehabilitation, Water Resources Department,
Government Of Bihar, Patna
4. The Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department, Dehri
5. The Superintendent Engineer, Water Resources Department Dehri Durgawati
Construction Circle, Bhitri Bandh, Department Of Water Resources, Kaimur At
Bhabhua
6. The Executive Engineer Dehri, Department of Water Resources, Kaimur At
Bhabhua
7. The Rehabilitation and Land Acquisition Officer Durgawati Water Project,
Department Of Water Resources Kaimur At Bhabua

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy

For The Respondent/s : Mr. Pandey S Sahay, SC 31

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY KUMAR TRIPATHI

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 25-02-2016

Acquisition of land is not a gold mine that the entire
family will beget employment under the State.

No doubt, there was a policy decision taken by the State
to provide employment to one family member whose land was
acquired for construction of Durgawati Reservoir in the district of
Kaimur. The writ has been filed by the petitioner looking for
employment because he contends that land was acquired for the same
said project.

Counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the State.

They have categorically stated in paragraphs 7 and 9 that father of the petitioner has already been provided employment under the same said scheme and is working since 1982. When the land was acquired, only one member of the family was required to be given employment and not every employable person, who was not even employable when the land was taken over by way of acquisition. This petitioner was a minor at that time and that is why his father was provided employment.

In view of the above, there is no case in favour of the petitioner for a mandamus or direction for his employment under the head of land acquisition.

Writ is dismissed.

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi, J)

sk

U			
---	--	--	--