

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11996 of 2023

=====

Anand Raj S/o Dhananjay Kumar Singh, Resident of Village Bahira Tola,
Vrindavan, P.O.- Lohchi, P.S.- Haveli, Kharagpur, Distt- Munger, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Road and Surface Transport, New Delhi.
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Road and Surface Transport, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
3. The Chairman, National Highway Authority of India, New Delhi.
4. The Secretary, National Highway Authority of India, New Delhi.
5. The Project Director, National Highway Authority of India, Project Implementation Unit, Munger.
6. The Divisional Commissioner, Munger Division.
7. The District Magistrate, Munger.
8. The Superintendant of Police, Munger.
9. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Haveli Kharagpur, Munger.
10. M/s Monte Carlo Construction Limited Company, Monte Carlo House, Sindhu Bhawan Road, Boadhak Dev, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, Pin-380058.
11. Md. Sarvar Alam S/o Kalim Uddin (Survey Manager), Resident of Raj Valley, P.O-Dagrua, Distt.-Purnea, Pin- 854326.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Shambhu Sharan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Additional Solicitor General
For the NHAI	:	Dr. Maurya Vijay Chandra, Advocate
		Mr. Gaurav Govinda, Advocate
		Ms. Ankita Kumari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 19-02-2024 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court for the following reliefs:

“(i) For issuance of appropriate writ(s) thereby commanding the respondents to remove the encroachment made upon the petitioner's



agricultural land measuring about 11.25 dec. (4 Kathas) at Mauja, Vrindavan, Pargana Sikhravadi, Thana and Sub-Registry Haveli Kharagpur, Distt. Munger bearing Tauzi No. 6268, Thana no. 22, Khata no. 7, Khesra no. 22 on which the respondents have stored construction materials by fencing the said land with fork wire, cemented pole and tin shades and by installing concrete plant, bore well, concrete foundational material stock, mobile tower, transformer, etc., thereby destroying the productivity of the Petitioner's agricultural land.

(ii) For further commanding the respondents to pay the petitioner sum of Rs. 10 lakhs as compensation for destruction of fertility of the petitioner's agricultural land which have been illegally encroached without the consent and/or permission of the petitioner or any family member of the petitioner.

(iii) For grant of any other relief(s) which the petitioner maybe entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. The dispute between the petitioner and the respondent no. 10 is a private dispute and this Court will not interfere in such private dispute.

4. The petitioner may move the District Court for redressal of his grievances.

5. Accordingly, this application stands disposed of.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

U			
---	--	--	--

