

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17493 of 2018

=====

Ashok Rajak Son of Sukhdev Rajak Resident of Village- Rahikapur Ward No.
2, Police Station- Araria, District- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through The Secretary, Road Surface and Tnaspport Department, Government of India, New Delhi.
2. The General Manager, North East Frontier Railway, Guwahati, Assam.
3. The Railway Board, New Delhi.
4. The Prime Minister Office, New Delhi.
5. The Managing Director, National Highways of India, New Delhi.
6. The Project Director, National Highways of India, District- Araria.
7. The Principal Secretary, Land Reforms Revenue Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
8. The District Magistrate, Araria.
9. The District Land Acquisition Officer, District- Araria.
10. The Executive Engineer, National Highways Authority of India, District- Araria.
11. The Chief Engineer, National Highways Division, Road Construction Department, District- Araria.
12. The Assistant Engineer, National Highways Sub-Division, District- Araria.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kamal Kishore Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Md. Khurshid Alam- Aag12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

2 06-01-2020 The petition filed on 29.08.2018 is listed for hearing
for the first time today before the Court.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the respondents.



Petitioner has prayed for the following relief:

“That this public interest litigation is being filed for a direction to the respondents/authorities not to change the length and width of the original approved drawing No. CET/3363/P5LCK745 PRGAD of the rail over bridge at N.H. 9-327, FKJ-45 and others necessary amenities related with ROB in public interest, safety and smooth movement of transport and/or pass such other appropriate order/direction or orders/directions as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the mentioned facts and circumstances of this case.”

After the matter was heard for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner shall be content if a direction is issued to the concerned respondents to consider and decide the representation, which the petitioner shall be making afresh within a period of four weeks from today.

Learned counsel for the State states that upon receipt of such request, if any, the same shall be dealt with in accordance with law, expeditiously and positively within a period of three months from the date of receipt thereof.

Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

We are hopeful that as and when petitioner takes



recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law,
before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in
accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

BT/-

U			
---	--	--	--

