

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 5189 of 2021**

1. Basant Lal Dixena S/o Late Vishwanath Dixena, Aged About 71 Years R/o Village Mungadih, Block Pali, District Korba (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Public Works Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh),
2. Collector, District Korba (Chhattisgarh), District : Korba, Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue)/ Competent Authority (Land Acquisition), Katghora, District Korba (Chhattisgarh), District : Korba, Chhattisgarh
4. Union Of India, Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Road, Transport And National Highways, New Delhi (India), District : New Delhi, Delhi
5. Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, National Highway Division, Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh), District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. National Highways Authority Of India, Through Its Project Director, Project Implementation Unit, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Himanshu Soni, Advocate.
For State	:	Mrs. Astha Shukla, P.L.
For Union of India	:	Mr. Tushar Dhar Diwan, Advocate.
For Respondent No. 6	:	Mr. Dhiraj Kumar Wankhede, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****15.12.2021**

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ petition seems to be aggrieved by the inadequate compensation that the petitioner has been awarded in the course of acquiring her property for the

purpose of construction of National Highway No. 111 (New No. 130).

2. According to the petitioner, the authorities have not applied proper multiplier while quantifying the compensation. Similarly, the authorities concerned have applied different yardsticks for similar nature of properties lying adjacent to each other and in the process, different rates of compensation have been given to different owners which also is arbitrary.
3. Perusal of the record would show that the properties were acquired in the present case applying the provisions of the National Highways Act, 1956 (in short "the Act of 1956"). Section 3 G (5) of the Act of 1956 reads as under:

"3G(5) If the amount determined by the competent authority under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) is not acceptable to either of the parties, the amount shall on an application by either of the parties, be determined by the arbitrator to be appointed by the Central Government."

4. It has been informed by the learned ASG that the Additional Commissioner of Bilaspur Division has been appointed as the authority to act as an Arbitrator for determining proper compensation. Considering the nature of claim raised by the petitioner and also the fact that the claim of the petitioner is one which can be decided only after due verification and scrutiny of the revenue records and also on physical verification of the actual acquisition done, this Court is of the opinion that the matter needs to be dealt with before the Additional Commissioner under the provisions of Section 3 G (5) of the Act of 1956.

5. Subject to the petitioner approaching the Additional Commissioner, the Additional Commissioner shall decide the same objectively by passing a speaking order. The petitioner is directed to raise his dispute before the Additional Commissioner in accordance with law at the earliest, preferably within a period of 2 weeks from today and the Additional Commissioner is expected to take a decision at the earliest.
6. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

P. Sam Koshy
Judge