

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3959 of 2017**

=====

Santosh Kumar @ Mohan son of Sahdeo Singh, Resident of Village- Teuse,  
P.O.- Teuse, Police Station- Jairampur, District- Shekhpura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Shekhpura, District- Shekhpura.
3. The Additional District Magistrate, Shekhpura, District- Shekhpura.
4. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Sheikhpura.
5. The Anchal Adhikari, Barbigaha, District- Shekhpura.
6. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Shekhpura, District- Shekhpura.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Verma, Advocate  
For the State : Mr. Birendra Prasad Singh, AC to SC-19

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      09-09-2025                      Heard Mr. Santosh Kumar Verma, learned counsel  
  
for the petitioner and Mr. Birendra Prasad Singh, learned AC to  
  
SC-19 representing the State.

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

*“for issuance of writ in the nature of  
mandamus directing the respondents to create  
Jamabandi and issue rent receipt after receiving  
the amount from the petitioner so that the  
petitioner may receive the amount of  
compensation arising out from the acquisition of*



*land as directed by the Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Sheikhpura and the District Land Acquisition Officer, Shekhpura. And any other order or orders as Your Lordships may deem fit and proper.”*

3. The matter relates to Khata No. 1271, plot no. 3731 (area 1.91 acres) as also plot no. 3733 (area 47 decimals) at Mauza Teuse in the district of Sheikhpura.

4. The submission is that for want of revenue receipt, the petitioner has been denuded of the compensation amount for the Daniyawa-Sheikhpura railway line construction that took place. Further submission is that a petition was preferred before the Collector, Sheikhpura (Annexure-10) which has not been taken to its logical conclusion till date.

5. As usual, the State has not come up with any counter affidavit and as such, this Court is unable to move further. The option is either to impose cost while granting adjournment, the alternative is what has been prayed by the learned counsel for the petitioner to be considered by the Collector, Sheikhpura and to dispose of the representation, if still not disposed of.

6. This Court deems it appropriate that the petitioner prefers a fresh representation before the Collector, Sheikhpur, if



the earlier (representation is still pending) along with all the relevant documents and the Collector, Sheikhpura shall be taking up the matter and getting it dispose of after hearing all the parties.

7. The writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

vinayak/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

