

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7583 of 2018

=====

Ranjay Kumar Singh @ Ranjay Singh, Son of Bhagwat Singh, Resident of
Village-Koshdihra, P.S.-Baroon, District-Aurangabad Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India and Ors
2. The Union of India through its General Manager Cum Project Director,
Project Compliance Unit Nation
3. The State of Bihar.
4. The Director, Land Acquisition Bihar, Patna.
5. The Collector, Aurangabad Bihar.
6. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Aurangabad Bihar.
7. The Arbitrator Cum Additional Collector, Aurangabad.
8. The Competent Authority Cum L.R. D.C., Aurangabad Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Arif Daula Siddiqui, Advocate
For the NHAI	:	Ms. Iti Suman, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-09-2024 Heard Mr. Birendra Kumar Singh, learned Advocate

for the petitioner, Ms. Iti Suman, learned Advocate for NHAI

and Mr. Arif Daula Siddiqui, learned Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated
25.05.2017 as contained in Annexure 7 to the writ petition
passed by learned Arbitrator cum Additional Collector,
Aurangabad in Land Acquisition Case No. 74/16-17 whereby
and where under the learned Arbitrator has dismissed the
application of the petitioner for adequate compensation, without



considering the materials available on record.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been deprived at the hands of the official respondents to get adequate compensation as per the nature of the land which is of high potential value and also commercial in nature.

4. Learned Advocate for the NHAI has made preliminary objection and submitted that the petitioner has statutory remedy available under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 to challenge the award before the Principle Civil Court.

5. Having considered the submissions made on behalf of the respective parties and taking note of the relief sought for in the present writ petition, this Court deems it apt and proper to dispose of the writ petition with a liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate miscellaneous case before the Principle Civil Court, if he is so advised.

6. Suffice it to say that the period which has been spent before this Court in pursuing the present application may be considered sympathetically in view of Section 14 of the Limitation Act, while considering the application for condonation of delay.



7. The writ petition stands disposed off with the liberty aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

