

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.491 of 2019

=====

Setu Kumar @ Banti Singh Son of late Nawal Kishore Singh Resident of
Patna Gaddi Road, P.O .. P.S. - Jay Nagar, District - Madhubani .

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. National Highway Of Authority India Through Project Director and Ors
2. Additional Collector- -cum- Arbitration . Officer, Madhubani, District -
Madhubani
3. District Land Acquisition Officer, Madhubani, District - Madhubani

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Raj Kishore Roy, GP-18

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 23-04-2024 Heard Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Raj Kishore Roy, G.P.-18 as also Mr.

Shrinath Pathak representing the N.H.A.I.

2. The instant writ application is being filed inter
alia for the following reliefs :-

*(I) For issuance of writ in the nature of
Mandamus, to command competent
Authority cum District land Acquisition
Officer, Madhubai (Respondent No.-4) to
take appropriate action and appropriate
order for redressal of grievance of the
petitioner.*



(II) For issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus to command respondent no. 4 to give compensation to the petitioners on equal terms of adjacent plot.

(III) For any other relief/reliefs which the petitioner entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. It is unfortunate that despite the matter having been remanded to the competent authority in this case, the District Land Acquisition Officer, Madhubani on 14.05.2018 relating to Land Acquisition of N.H. 104 (Banti Singh vs. N.H.A.I.) according to learned counsel for the petitioner, the same has still not been taken to its logical conclusion.

4. The learned counsel for the State despite service of two copies of the writ petition in the year 2018 submit that the office do not have any instruction, though, letter was issued.

5. In that background, the Court has the option to impose heavy cost upon the respondent No.4 (District Land Acquisition Officer, Madhubani) for not filing reply while keeping the case of the petitioner pending, it refrains from doing so and instead intends to dispose of the writ petition.

6. Accepting the words of the learned counsel for



the petitioner that the competent authority has still not passed the order, direction is issued to him to take the matter to its logical conclusion, if still not taken within a period of four months from the date the petitioner submits fresh application along with the copy of this order.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Guddu/-

U			
---	--	--	--

