

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11199 of 2017**

=====

Ghoorbigni Kuer Wife of late Sohrai Yadav Resident of Village- Mangabar,  
P.S. N.T.P.C. Khaira and District Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Verma, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, Gp14

=====

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

2      22-04-2025                      Heard Mr. Anirudh Kumar Verma, learned counsel  
  
for the petitioner and Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, learned  
  
G.P.14.

2. The present application has been filed:

*directing the concerned authority  
to delete the name of other persons except  
the petitioner from the award arising out of  
L.A. case no. 1/2005-06 whose names have  
been wrongly entered into the award and  
inspite of giving affidavit by those persons  
for deleting their name the authority  
concerned has not deleted names and the  
petitioner being lady has been suffering  
problems due to inaction on the part of the  
concerned authority.*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



contrary to the claim by the State, actually different person have received compensation and not the petitioner.

4. Learned State Counsel on the other hand has taken this Court to the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent no. 2 and 3 with specific reference to the paragraph 13 which shows that the award amount as also the additional compensation for the acquired land already stands received by the petitioner without any objection.

5. Learned State Counsel further submits that this counter affidavit was served upon the learned counsel for the petitioner in the year 2019 and in absence of any reply/rebuttal, the claim cannot be considered.

6. This Court is in full conformity with the submission of the learned State Counsel. However, if the petitioner's case is that some compensation amount has still not been paid, that is a separate issue and he can always agitate the matter. So far as the present case is concerned, in view of the categorical statement made by the State in its counter affidavit which has not been rebutted for six years, no case is made out.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the petition to agitate the matter before an appropriate forum.



8. Granting said liberty and without commenting anything on the merit of the case, the writ petition stands disposed of.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Vijay Singh/-

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

