

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APELLATE SIDE**

WPA 24184 of 2019

Arun Kiran Nandan

- Versus -

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

**Mr. Partha Pratim Roy
Mr. Dyutiman Banerjee**

.....For the petitioner

**Mr. Rabindra Narayan Dutta
Mr. Suprabhat Bhattacharya**

.....For the State

Ms. Manika Roy

**....For the National Highway
Authority of India**

Leave is granted to the petitioner to correct the cause-title of the writ petition during the course of the day.

The grievance of the petitioner in this application is against the inaction on the part of the respondent no. 3, the Additional District Magistrate (Land Acquisition), Bankura to refer his claim for higher amount of compensation under Section 3-G of the National Highway Act, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as “the Act of 1956”).

The claim of the petitioner for compensation arises on account of acquisition of his land situate in the District of Bankura for the project of upgradation of 2 lane with paved shoulder of NH 60. By the award dated March 31, 2018 the respondent no. 3 assessed the compensation receivable by the petitioner at Rs.6,25,443/- which was not accepted by the petitioner. By a communication,

which was received by the respondent no. 3 on February 6, 2019, the petitioner requested the said respondent to refer his claim for higher amount of compensation to arbitration under Section 3G(5) of the Act of 1956. In spite of receipt of the said request for referring his claim for higher compensation, the respondent no. 3 sat tight over the matter.

When this application was taken up for hearing on December 14, 2020, learned counsel appearing for the State respondents produced an instruction in writing issued by the respondent no. 3 wherefrom it appears that it is the respondent no. 5, the Divisional Commissioner, Medinipur Division who has been appointed as the Arbitrator by the National Highway Authority to decide her claim for higher amount of compensation for acquired land in the District of Bankura.

At this juncture, Ms. Manika Roy, counsel appearing for the respondent National Highway Authority submitted that she has the specific instruction that the petitioner's land in question has not been acquired by the National Highway Authority for any land in Bankura utilized by the National Highway Authority.

However, such submission of the counsel for the National Highway Authority appears to be a reckless submission without going through the papers disclosed in the writ petition. A bare reading of the notice dated September 28, 2018, Annexure P-3 to the writ petition shows that the respondent no. 3 had assessed the

compensation for the petitioner's land being used under the Act of 1956 for the project of "Upgradation of 2 lane with paved shoulder of NH 60".

Considering the facts of the case, the respondent no. 3 is directed to forward all records of the petitioner's case to the respondent no. 5 positively within January 15, 2021. Thereafter, the respondent no. 5 shall publish the arbitral award deciding the petitioner's claim for higher amount of compensation within eight weeks after granting opportunities of hearing to the petitioner.

With the above directions, the application WPA 24184 of 2019 stands disposed of.

There shall, however, no order as to costs.

All parties shall act in terms of the copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Ashis Kumar Chakraborty, J.)