

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7830 of 2018

=====

Krishna Murari Gupta son of Late Kashinath Sah, resident of Village-
Jamalpur, P.O. Atimi, P.S. Nasariganj Circle Nasariganj, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. The D.C.L.R. Bikramganj, District Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. The Circle Officer, Nasariganj District Rohtas at Sasaram.
6. Radhika Raman Prasad Gupta, son of Late Kashi Nath Gupta, resident of
Village- Jamalpur, P.O. Atimi, P.S. Nasariganj, Circle Nasariganj, District-
Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocat
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ebadur Rahman, AC to AAG-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-08-2024 Heard Mr. Raghunanadan Kumar Singh, learned

Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Ebadur Rahman, learned

Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated
24.08.2017 passed in Case No.2/3(i)/17-18 by the respondent
No.3 by which the claim of the petitioner has been rejected for
getting the amount of award in lieu of the land of the petitioner
situated under Thana No.62, Circle Nasariganj, Khata No.147,
Khesra No.1123 Area 0.45 acres acquired by the respondent.

3. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of



respondent Nos.2 to 5. Categorical averments have been made in Paragraph Nos. 10 to 12 that the objection of the petitioner was duly considered in the light of the revenue records and on being found that the land in question has been purchased by one Radhika Raman Gupta through sale deed No.7342 dated 15.10.2016 and the same was mutated in her name vide Mutation Case No.769/2016-17. Accordingly, the compensation has been awarded to her.

4. At this juncture, learned Advocate for the State submits that if the petitioner has any grievance, he has the remedy as provided under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

5. Considering the nature of the grievance, the writ petition stands disposed off with the liberty to the petitioner to file an appropriate application before respondent No.2 who shall refer the matter to the competent authority under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

6. On reference being made, the competent authority shall look into the grievance of the petitioner and dispose off the same in accordance with law, preferably within a period of three



months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this
order.

(Harish Kumar, J)

durgesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

