

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16001 of 2017

=====

Smt. Sitapati Devi Wife of Sri Rajendra Prasad Singh Resident of Village -
Negha Bigha, Police Station Sailiya, District Aurangabad, at present resident
of Negha Bigha, House Club Road, P.O., P.S. and District Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Gaya.
4. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
5. The Land Acquisition Officer, Aurangabad.
6. The Land Revenue Development Officer, Aurangabad.
7. The Circle Officer, Sadar, Aurangabad.
8. The Divisional Zonal Manager, N.H. Division Varanasi, U.P.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Akhilesh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Md.Zeeshan Kalim, AC to SC-20

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2025 Heard Mr. Akhilesh Kumar Sinha, learned counsel
for the petitioner and the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief/s:

*(i) for issuance of writ in the nature of
Mandamus or any other appropriate
writ/order or direction to the respondent to
pay the compensation of the entire land in
question as per the Right to fair*



compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 to the petitioner and to quash the order dated 03.07.2017 passed by Arbitrator;

(ii) for issuance of writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ /order or direction respondents to determine/calculate to the compensation as per market value of land and interest, cost etc. taking into account the nature of land as mentioned in the representation of petitioner submitted to respondent no. 5;

(iii) for any other appropriate writ for which the petitioner is otherwise entitled in the eye of law.

3. The counter affidavit on behalf of respondent no.8 , the National Highways Division Varanasi, U.P. is on record and para-3 incorporates that the petitioner has alternative remedy under section 34 and 36 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 before a competent Civil Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner in that



background submits that she shall be moving before appropriate Court.

5. Granting said liberty and if it is filed, the Court shall take into account that the writ petition was pending before this Court for eight years while taking up the limitation petition for condoning the delay.

6. The writ petition is disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

