

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14911 of 2017

=====

Laxman Gope

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar and Ors

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : None

For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Nutan Sahay, Aag12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 17-06-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though

Mrs. Nutan Sahay, learned AC to AAG-12 is present.

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

*(i) for quashing the order dated
01.04.2017 passed by Additional District
Land Acquisition Officer-Cum - D.C.L.R.,
Masaurhi (Respondent no. 5) passed in L.A.
case No-06/15-16 whereby he has passed
order for payment of compensation in favor
of respondent no-6 (Uman) for
infrastructure and Go-down of factory which
is subject matter of Acquisition for
construction of six lane bridge over river
Ganges.*

*(ii) for further direction upon the
respondent authorities to pay the
compensation of infrastructure and Go-down*



in question to the petitioner which admittedly belongs to the petitioner being his ancestral property and structure were raised by the petitioner out of his own fund.

(iii) for further to hold that in view of rival claim made by the petitioner and respondent No-6 with respect to entitlement for receiving compensation should not have been decided by the respondent no. 6, in such a summary manner rather the dispute should have been referred to the civil court under section 30 of the Land Acquisition Act, and direction be issued to respondent no. 6 to the refer the matter to the civil court for its decision.

(iv) for further direction upon the state respondents not to make any further payment to respondent no. 6 during pendency of this writ application for the land in question.

(v) for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. A counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent nos. 2 to 5 is on record and learned State Counsel has taken this Court to paragraphs 11 to 17 to show that the petitioner ought to have moved before the land acquisition, resettlement and rehabilitation authority, Patna for the redressal of his claim



under statutory provision of Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

4. However, since there is no appearance, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

