

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16513 of 2016

=====

Amrawati Devi W/o Sudhir 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, Revenue and Land Reforms, 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. Raj Kishore Roy-Gp18
For the Railways	:	Mr. Ratnesh Kumar, Sr. CGC

=====

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, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act (30 of 2013) and direct the respondents to fix the



compensation amount under the new Act and according to market value.”

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. 16513 of 2016

6. The matter relates to the construction of the Naura-Daniyawa 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			
---	--	--	--

