

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8739 of 2016

=====

Brij Bhushan Prasad Sinha Son of Late Jagat Prasad Singh, resident of village- Manjhbey Police Station Hisua, District Nawada, Presently residing at L/Q-10, Opposite P.G. Hostel 2, B.R.A,Bihar University Campus, Khabra Road, Police Station University P.S. District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Divisional Commissioner
3. The District Magistrate-cum- Collector Nawada, District Nawada
4. The Additional Collector, Nawada
5. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Nawada Sadar, District- Nawada
6. The Land Acquisition Officer, Nawada District- Nawada.
7. The Circle Officer, Hisua, District Nawada
8. The Union of India, through Ministry of Surface transport, New Delhi
9. The National Highway Authority of India, through its Chairman, New Delhi
10. Smt. Gyanti Devi, Wife of Sri Mukund Pd. Singh.
11. Smt. Pratima Devi wife of Sri Anandi Pd. Singh Both are resident of village- Manjhbey Police Station, Hisua, District Nawada

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prashant Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. AC to GA-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-02-2024 Heard Mr. Prashant Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner as also learned AC to GA-3.

*The present writ petition has been filed
for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus
or any other appropriate writ for a direction upon
the respondent, particularly respondent No.4
(Additional Collector Nawada) to get the demand
cancellation case No. 11/2014 -15 disposed of*



expeditiously, which earlier has been preferred by the petitioner on 26/07/2014 and pending before him since then for cancellation of demand fraudulently created in the name of respondent No.10 and 11 by committing grave forgery and by furnishing false case numbers with sole intention to grab the amount of compensation against the land in question, which is belonging exclusively in the name of petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a simple Demand Cancellation Case No. 11/2014-15 preferred by him in the year 2014 has not been decided by the respondent no. 4, the Additional Collector, Nawada. According to him till date, the same has not been decided.

3. A counter affidavit of the year 2017 by the respondent nos. 3,4 and 7 averred that due to the fact that the Additional Collector was not posted, the matter could not be disposed of.

4. We are in the year 2024 and there is no information till date from the State in this regard.

5. Instead of keeping the writ petition pending, it would be appropriate that a direction be issued to the respondent no.4, the Additional Collector, Nawada to dispose of the Demand Cancellation Case No. 11/2014-15, if still it has not been disposed of.



6. Needless to say the same has to be disposed of in accordance with law after putting each and every affected party to notice and after hearing.

7. The entire process be completed within a period of six months from today.

8. The writ stands disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Jagdish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

