

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3269 of 2017**

=====

1. Ram Narayan Shaw, Son of Ramchandara Shaw, resident of Village and Post-Kharika, P.S. Sonapur, District - Saran, At present residing at Village Kharika, P.S. Sonapur, District - Saran.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector, District Saran.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sonapur, District Saran.
5. The Anchal Adhikari, Sonapur, District - Saran.
6. The Land Acquisition officer, District Saran.
7. The Divisional Railways Manager, Sonapur, District Saran.
8. The Senior Project Manager, Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Limited, Work Division-1, Patna.
9. Arbind Kumar Singh, S/o Ram Naresh Singh, resident of At & P.O. Kharika, P.S. Sonapur, District - Saran.
10. Shankar Raj.
11. Hira Raj, Respondent Nos. 10 to 11 are sons of Late Deo Charan Raj, Resident of Village - Gayaylal, P.S. Sonapur, District - Saran.

.... .... Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Dharendra Kumar Jha

For the Respondents : Mr. SUBHASH CHANDRA YADAV-GP15

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date: 18-08-2018**

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

This writ application has been preferred for a  
direction to the respondent-authorities to make payment of  
compensation to the petitioner as the land of the petitioner



acquired for the purpose of laying of railway track known as Digha Sonepur Rail-cum-Road Approach.

Contention of the petitioner is that Plot No. 2842 under Khata No. 14, Area 9 Katha, 19 Dhur, Plot No. 2843 and 2844 under the same Khata, Area 16 decimals and 2 decimals respectively in village Ganjajal, Anchal Sonepur in the district of Saran was acquired by the respondent-authorities. The said land stands recorded in the name of grandfather of the petitioner and in the name of brothers of the grandfather.

The aforesaid grievance requires inquiry and collection of evidence which cannot be done in exercise of writ jurisdiction. Moreover, the petitioner has got statutory remedy under the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. Hence, the petitioner may avail statutory remedy of objection, if so advised.

With the aforesaid observation, this writ application stands disposed of.

**(Birendra Kumar, J)**

Kundan/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | N.A.       |
| CAV DATE          | N.A.       |
| Uploading Date    | 21.08.2018 |
| Transmission Date | N.A.       |

