

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20891 of 2014

=====

Susheel Yadav Son of Late Bharat Yadav Resident of Village - Jitan Chhapra,
P.O- Rajipur, P.S.- Ranitalab, District -Patna

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Collector, Patna
3. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Flood Control Scheme Office situated at Anishabad, District -Patna
4. Satrugan Yadav Son of Late Ram Awadh Yadav Resident of Village - Jitan Chhapra, P.O.- Rajipur, P.S.- Ranitalab, District - Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr. Md. R. Haque, SC 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 10-10-2017

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents and the private respondent no. 4 to pay half share of the cost of the land which was acquired by the Government under the Flood Control Scheme.

2. None appears on behalf of the petitioner despite repeated calls. The petitioner was also not represented when the matter was called on the last occasion on 03.10.2017.

3. A perusal of the writ petition discloses that the land in question was acquired by the Government under the Flood Control Scheme through Land Acquisition Case No. 06 of 2012-13 for widening the Jitan Chhapra Channel, against which compensation of Rs. 6,73,312/- was determined. The petitioner claims half share in the land and is aggrieved by the fact that the



cheques for the compensation amount has been prepared entirely in the name of his uncle Satrugshan Yadav (Respondent No. 4) and the same has since been paid.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents on the other hand submits that no fault can be found with the action of the respondents in making due payment of the compensation amount to the respondent no. 4. It is submitted that the petitioner never represented the matter at the time of acquisition by making claim of having half share in the land. The award was finally made in the name of the respondent no. 4 and the respondents were accordingly bound to pay the amount of compensation to the respondent no. 4 which has duly been done.

5. In the above circumstances, this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the matter. The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	11.10.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

