

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.278 of 2015

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 954 of 2010

=====

Chandra Madho Upadhyay, Son of Late Ramshakal Upadhyay, Resident of
Village - Babhan Gawan, Post Office - Gundi, P.S. - Krishnagarh Barhara,
District - Bhojpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar State Power Holding Co. Ltd.
2. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Power Holding Co. Ltd., Sri Pratyay Amrit
3. The Managing Director, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Patna, Smt. Palka Sahni.
4. The Deputy General Manager, Patna, Sri Rajiv Amit
5. The Superintendent Engineer, Electric Circle, Ara Sri Arun Kumar
6. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Rural Electrification Division, Ara, Sri Surendra Kumar
7. The State of Bihar
8. The Collector, Bhojpur at Ara, Sri Pankaj Kumar Pal
9. The Additional Collector, Bhojpur at Ara Sri Suresh Kumar Sinha
10. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Bhojpur at Ara Sri Rajiv Kumar Singh.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Surendra Mishra, Advocate
For Respondent-SBPDCL	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma, Advocate
		Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bishwa Bibhuti Kumar Singh,
		A.C. to A.G.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

6 25-01-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned counsel appearing for the South Bihar Power Distribution

Company Ltd. as well as the learned counsel for the State.

A show cause has been filed in this case and it

appears from the said show cause that the order under contempt



stands complied with.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has objections and submits that the petitioner has been paid compensation not according to the nature of land and market value. However, the show cause clearly indicates that the compensation calculated by the District Collector is as per the market value after the New Act came into force, i.e., as on 01.01.2014.

Since there has been substantial compliance of the order passed by this Court, I am not inclined to proceed further in the contempt application. It is, accordingly, disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to raise any such issue as is being contested before this Court.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

PNM

U			
---	--	--	--

