

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 2689 of 2021

1. Anand Khedia, S/o Late Radheshyam Khedia, Aged About 53 Years R/o - A -30, Rama Life City Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, Tahsil - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
2. Murli Khedia, S/o Late Radheshyam Khedia, Aged About 50 Years R/o - A -30, Rama Life City Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, Tahsil - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Vinod Khedia, S/o Late Radheshyam Khedia, Aged About 48 Years R/o - A -30, Rama Life City Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, Tahsil - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. Balmukund Khedia, S/o Late Radheshyam Khedia, Aged About 45 Years R/o - A -30, Rama Life City Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, Tahsil - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
5. Vyenkteshwar Khedia, S/o Late Radheshyam Khedia, Aged About 45 Years R/o - A -30, Rama Life City Sakri, Police Station - Sakri, Tahsil - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

--- Petitioners

Versus

1. Union of India, through The Secretary, Department of Road, Transport And Highways, 5th Floor, Transport Bhawan-1, Parliament Street, New Delhi, Delhi - 11001, District : New Delhi, Delhi
2. Authorized Officer (Land - Acquisition) Cum Sub - Divisional Officer (Revenue) Bilaspur, Tahsil And District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Project Director, National Highways Authorities of India, Project Operation Unit, Abhilasha Parisar, New Bus Stand Bilaspur, Tahsil And District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
4. Commissioner / Arbitrator, Bilaspur Division Bilaspur, Tahsil And District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

--- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ratnesh Kumar Agrawal, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Rahul Jha, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

06.07.2021

1. Heard
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that against the award of compensation for construction of the road, the petitioners being aggrieved with the quantum had approached the Arbitrator under Section 3G of the National Highways Act 1956 (hereinafter referred as 'the Act of 1956') and the proceedings commenced on 04.05.2019. He submits that thereafter the Arbitrator, who is the Commissioner Bilaspur i.e. respondent No. 4, sought for certain clarification from the Patwari which too was submitted in the year 2019 by Annexure P/5. It is stated that even thereafter

also the petition is pending, therefore the Arbitrator-Commissioner i.e. respondent No. 4 may be directed to conclude the proceeding within a stipulated time.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the case of the petitioners would be decided as early as possible.
4. Considering the limited prayer made whereby only the adjudication of proceeding under Section 3G of the Act of 1956 has been sought for and since the document shows that the proceedings had already commenced on 04.05.2019, under these circumstances, the Arbitrator/ Commissioner Bilaspur Division is directed to decide the proceeding under Section 3G of the Act of 1956 within a further period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
5. With the aforesaid observation/ direction, the writ petition stands disposed off.

**Sd/-
(GOUTAM BHADURI)
JUDGE**

Rao