

Conciliation Act, 1996 challenging the award. She also disputes the fact that the subject land is viti land.

Mr. Soumitra Bandhopadhyay, Advocate appearing on behalf of the State, submits that the petitioner has received the entire compensation and is now estopped from challenging the same. He further submits that the writ petition is not maintainable. He also submits that the petitioner has an adequate alternative statutory remedy.

I have heard the parties. It is an admitted fact that the final award under Section 3 of the National Highways Act, 1956 has been passed and the petitioner had participated in such proceedings.

It appears that the grievance of the petitioner is now being raised for the first time and had not been raised before the Arbitrator.

The decision cited by the petitioner is distinguishable and inapposite to the facts of this case.

In view of the alternative efficacious statutory remedy available to the petitioner I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition.

WPA No. 1196 of 2020 stands dismissed.

There will be, however, no order as to costs.

However, the petitioner is granted liberty to avail the alternative efficacious remedy, if so advised.

(Ravi Krishan Kapur,J)