

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10363 of 2024

=====

Ramvodh Yadav, S/o Yogendra Yadav, Resident of Village-Mukhiya Patti,
P.O.-Saharghat, P.S.-Saharghat, District-Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms (Land Acquisition), Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Water Resources, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Madhubani.
5. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Madhubani.
6. The Executive Engineer, West Koshi Canal Commissionary, Benipatti, Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajiv Prashant, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Anuj Kumar, AC to SC-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 18-07-2024 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and the

learned Advocate representing the State.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is confined to the extent that his land was acquired under Balwa Ghat Baraj-cum-Irrigation Yojana, Madhubani without making payment of due compensation to the petitioner in accordance with letter no. 5021 dated 18.12.2017 issued by Registration Department, Government of Bihar.



3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that irrespective of the fact that the nature of the land in question is of residential, the proposal for compensation has been made under the category of agricultural land. Aggrieved by the aforesaid decision, with respect to the nature of land, the petitioner approached before the District Land Acquisition Officer as well as the Collector, Madhubani but, till date, his objection has not been considered and disposed of.

4. It is also the contention of the petitioner that though notice was issued, but in place of the name of the petitioner who had purchased the land in the year 2014, the name of his vendor was given and, as such, the petitioner could not be able to file objection at that point of time.

5. Considering the grievance of the petitioner and also the fact that he was deprived from filing objection on account of improper communication, moreover for redressal of his grievance, the petitioner has already filed a detailed representation before the Collector, let the writ petition stand disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation alongwith necessary documents in support of his claim before the Collector, Madhubani, preferably within a



period of 2 weeks. If such a representation is filed, the Collector, Madhubani shall consider the same and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a further period of 6 weeks.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

