

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10089 of 2024

=====

Nirmala Devi, W/o Sudhir Kumar Singh, R/o Vill.- Ranipur, P.S.- Phulwari Sharif, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt of Bihar.
2. The D.M., Patna.
3. The D.C.L.R., Patna.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Patna.
5. The Land Acquisition Officer, Patna.
6. The Circle Officer, Danapur, Patna.
7. Sub-Divisional Officer, Danapur, Patna.
8. Shambhu Prasad Singh, S/o- Late Karmchand Mistri, R/o Sarari, P.S.- Naubatpur, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate Mr. Raj Narayan Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Pleader 19
For the N.H.A.I.	:	Mr. S.N. Pathak, Advocate Mr. Saurabh Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 18-07-2024 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner, Learned Advocate for National Highways Authority of India (N.H.A.I.) as well as the State.

2. The petitioner by invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking a direction upon the respondent authorities to ensure the admissible payment under the scheme of Danapur



Elevated Corridor.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has purchased the land in question from his vendor, Sri Chandrashekhar Prasad, S/o Late Karmchand Mistri, R/o Sarari, Post – Karanja, P.S. Naubatpur, Patna on 04.02.2012; since then the petitioner has been coming in continuous possession and the land in question was also mutated in her name. In the mean time, the land in question was acquired and the authority concerned, has directed to pay an amount of Rs. 1,41,79,285.23/- on 14.03.2023 but the amount has not been paid to the petitioner only on the ground of objection filed by the respondent no. 8, is the contention of the petitioner.

4. At this stage, learned Advocate for the N.H.A.I. made preliminary objection that the petitioner has expeditious statutory remedy available under the National Highway Act, 1956, especially in view of Section 3-H(4).

5. Considering the nature of the grievance, this Court finds substance in the submission of learned Advocate for the N.H.A.I.. The writ petition stands disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to avail the statutory remedy as provided under the National Highway Act, 1956.

6. The writ petition stands disposed of with the liberty



aforesaid.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

