

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16477 of 2016

=====

Kiran Singh S/o Late Ramugrah Singh, Resident of Village- Gabaspur, P.O.-
Jaitiya, P.S. Gaurichak, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India.
2. The General Manager, Eastern Central Railways, Hazipur.
3. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Reveue and Land Reform, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate/Collector, Patna and the District Land Acquisition, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rishi Raj Sinha- SC-19

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 04-08-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief(s):

*“for issuance of a writ in nature of
mandamus or any other appropriate
writ/order/direction, commanding Respondents to
re-start the land acquisition process in view of
New Act U/s 24 of Right of Fair Compensation
and transparency in Land Acquisition, Re-
habilitation and Re-settlement Act (30 of 2013)
and direct the State Govt. to fix the compensation*



amount changed scenario as per new Act.”

I.A. No. 01 of 2019

3. The aforesaid Interlocutory Application has been preferred for deleting the respondent no. 1, the Chairman, Railway Board, Ministry of Railway, New Delhi from the list of the respondents.

4. The prayer stands allowed and the **Interlocutory Application No. 01 of 2019** stands disposed of.

5. The name of the respondent no. 1 stands deleted from the respondent's list.

CWJC No. 16477 of 2016

6. The matter relates to the construction of the Naura-Daniyawara Railway Line Project which led to Land Acquisition Case No. 10 of 2005-06.

7. The claim of the petitioner is that though eighty percent amount of the award was paid, the same was under the old Act and as such, the grievance remains.

8. Learned State counsel submits that they should have approached the appropriate authority for the redressal of the grievance instead of invoking the writ jurisdiction.

9. In that background, the writ petition stands disposed of allowing the petitioner to approach before the



competent authority for the redressal of the grievance, if the same still remains.

10. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

