

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4774 of 2018

Ashok Kumar @ Ashok Kumar Singh

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Nigam Limited Through Its Chairman and Ors

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None.
For the State	:	Mrs. Nutan Sahay, AC to AAG 12
For the Respondent Nos. 1 to 5	:	Mr. Vikash Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2024 On call, no one appears on behalf of the petitioner though Mr. Vikash Kumar is representing respondent nos. 1 to 5 while Mrs. Nutan Sahay represent the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the following reliefs:-

(i) for setting aside letter dated 25.11.2017 was issued under signature of Deputy Chief Engineer, South Bihar Circle, Patna whereby and where under he informed that land bearing Tauzi no. 107, Thana No. 179, Khata No. 661, 662, Plot No. 1885, 1886 was not acquired for construction of Bridge and approaching road;

(ii) for giving direction to Respondent to pay compensation for land bearing Tauzi No. 107,



Thana No. 179, Mauza- Maharamchok, Khata No. 661, 662, Plot No. 1885, 1886, area 32.6 Decimal is being used by Respondents for purpose of approach road of newly constructed Palighat Bridge.

3. In absence of any assistance on behalf of the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Vikash Kumar took this Court to the paragraph-5 of the writ petition which read as follows:-

“5. That petitioner purchased land bearing Mauza-Maharamchak, Tauzi-107, Thana No.-179, Khata No. 661, 662, Plot No. 1885, 1886 vide sale deed dated 19.12.2016 from one Ramanuj Prasad Singh.”

4. He thereafter took this Court to Annexure-1, the letter dated 25.11.2017 issued by the office of Deputy Chief Engineer, South Bihar Circle, Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Nigam Limited addressed to the petitioner and annexing the letter no. 1380 dated 02.11.2017 by the Project Engineer, Sub-Division, Lakhisarai by which he was informed that the land in question is not amongst those which are being considered for acquisition.

5. Having gone through the clear communication by the respondent to the petitioner despite which he wants this Court to set it



aside and also to pay compensation, in the considered opinion of this Court either the petitioner failed to understand the document in question and/or was ill advised prompting him to file a writ petition.

6. The case is frivolous and fit to be dismissed with cost but as no one has appeared, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Neha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

