

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10458 of 2018

-
-
1. Dinesh Prasad Sinha and Ors Son of Late Bhagwan Singh, Resident of Village- Rashtranagar Rarha, Post- Rarha, P.S.- Dhanarua, District- Patna.
 2. Ravindra Prasad Singh, Son of Late Dipa Singh, Resident of Village- Repura, Post- Bheragwan, P.S.- Kadirganj, District- Patna.
 3. Pramod Kumar Singh, son of Late Shyamdeo Singh, Resident of Village- Repura, Post- Bheragawan, P.S.- Kadirganj, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India and Ors
2. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Road and Construction Department, Old Secretariate, Patna
3. The Principal Secretary, the Department of Road and Construction Government of Bihar, Old Secretariate, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the State	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar Ambastha, SC-26 Mr.Subodh Kumar, AC to SC-26

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 18-11-2024

On 28.10.2024, following order has been passed:-

Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed writ petition to pay compensation amount for the law, which has been acquired by the State Government for construction of Patna-Gaya-Dobhi four lane at the minimum prescribed rate per decimal fixed by it with interest.

2. From the perusal of writ petition, it is clear that no specific order has been challenged in the said writ petition.

3. None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

4. Re-list this matter on 18.11.2024.



5. It is made clear that no further time would be granted on the next date of hearing for the reasons that the matter is pending consideration for the last about six years and the matter would be decided with the available records.

2. Today none appeared for the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the State has submitted that petitioner has no grievance in respect of any order passed by any of the authorities, as same is evident from prayer portion of the writ petition and in the light of aforesaid fact, the present writ petition is not maintainable.

4. Be that as it may, for seeking writ of mandamus, there must be a demand before the competent authority. At the same time, duty is cast on the concerned public authority. The first ingredient of demand before the competent authority is not forthcoming.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of as not maintainable.

6. However, disposal of the writ petition would not be hurdle for the petitioner to represent his grievance before the concerned authority. If petitioner submits his representation before the concerned authority within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order, the competent authority is directed to hear the grievance of the petitioner and pass order expeditiously,



in accordance with law.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	19.11.2024
Transmission Date	N.A.

