

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17180 of 2024

Md. Anwarul Haque Son of Late Hanif, Grandson of Late Sheikh Qurban,
resident of Village-Banbhag, Tola-Kolah Toli, Ward No. 12, Nagar Panchayat
Amour, at P.O. and P.S.-Amour, District- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna-800001.
2. Principal Secretary Road Development Corporation (RDC) Government of Bihar, Patna, Pin Code-800001.
3. Director, Road Development Corporation (RDC), Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. Engineer in Chief, Head Quarters Road Development Corporation (RDC), Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Chief Engineer Road Development Corporation (RDC) North Bihar Range, Patna.
6. Superintendent Engineer (SE) Road Development Corporation (RDC) Road Circle, Purnea.
7. Executive Engineer Road Development Corporation (RDC) Purnea.
8. Collector, Purnea.
9. District Land Acquisition Officer, Purnea.
10. Sub Divisional Officer Baisi, District- Purnea.
11. Circle Officer (Anchal Adhikari) Amour, District- Purnea.
12. M/S SRE KAMAC (JV) Construction Company for State Highway (SH-99) running from NH-31 crossing at Baisi, District-Purnea to Dighal Bank, District- Kishanganj.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shabbir Ahmad
For the Respondent/s : AC to GA-9

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to Government Advocate No. 9.

2. The Court finds no merit in the writ application and
thus it is dismissed for the reasons recorded hereinbelow:



3. The instant writ application has been filed seeking a direction upon the respondents to pay fair compensation to the petitioner for their land taken for construction of State Highway (SH-99) running from N.H.-31 at Baisi Crossing in the district of Purnea to Dighal Bank in the district of Kishanganj.

4. On query of the Court from the learned counsel that since it has been pleaded in the prayer portion that the land has been acquired for construction of the State Highway (SH-99) but the notification is not on record on which the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the land has not been acquired but has been forcefully taken by the authorities for constructing a road but then there is no pleading to that effect in the writ application. The pleadings are confused, as such, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application.

5. Accordingly, the writ application stands dismissed.

6. However, the same would not preclude the petitioner from filing a fresh writ application with proper pleading.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Ranjeet/-

U			
---	--	--	--

