

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10019 of 2017

=====

Ranjit Singh Rana S/o- Late Jagdishwar Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-
Chaugain, P.O.- Chaugain, P.S.- Murar, District- Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited through its Managing Director, Bihar, Patna.
3. Managing Director, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Bihar, Patna.
4. Land Acquisition Officer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Bihar, Patna.
5. Electrical Superintending Engineer, Shahabad Electrical Circle, Arrah.
6. Superintending Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Arrah.
7. Executive Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Buxar.
8. District Land Acquisition Officer, Buxar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Suresh Kumar, AC to GP-1
For Respondent 2 to 7	:	Dr. Kislay. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2025 No one appears for the petitioner while learned State

counsel as also learned counsel for Respondent No.2 to 7-South

Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Buxar are present.

2. The petition has been filed for:

*“issuance of a writ of mandamus
seeking direction to respondent authorities to
make payment of compensation amount to the
petitioner as 33/11 KV Power Sub-Station had*



been constructed over their three acre lands situated at Village-Atami, P.S.-Nawanagar in Nawanagar block of Buxar district and also for payment of statutory interest as well as penal interest along with the costs for non-payment of compensation amount within stipulated time and for any other writ/writs, order/orders which the petitioner may found to be entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Counter affidavit on behalf of Respondent no. 2 to 7(South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Buxar) is on record and learned counsel has taken this Court to paragraph-9 to show that it was Sri Shailendra Prakash Sinha who own the land and never demanded any compensation and the petitioner is a frivolous person demanding compensation.

4. Though this case is fit to be dismissed with cost, in absence of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the same is dismissed for non prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

