

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19828 of 2018

=====

Lalmati Devi Wife of Late Jokhan Das R/o Mauza-Chikni, P.O.-Jokiyari, P.S.
Raxaul, District-East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Prinicipal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Bihar, Patna
4. The Director, Land Acquisition, Bihar, Patna
5. The Joint Secretary, Department of Home, Bihar, Patna
6. The Collector, Motihari
7. The Land Acquisition Officer, Motihari
8. The Union of India, through the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, through its Secretary
9. The Secretary, Border Management Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, North Block, New Delhi

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Mallika Mazumdar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Nutan Sahay, AC to AAG-12
For the UOI	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, Sr. CGC
	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar Verma, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

5 11-11-2025 Heard Ms. Mallika Mazumdar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, learned counsel representing the Union of India as also learned counsel representing the State.

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

“for a direction for payment of the



money to the farmers whose land have been acquired in 2011 by S.S.B. (Seema Surkhsa Bal) for Construction of its Head Quarters in Mauza Chikni, District East Champaran. And the entire compensation money has not been paid to farmers. The rest money should be paid with interest amount. That the remaining amount should be paid as per new Act.”

3. The petitioner's land was taken by the Sashastra Seema Bal (henceforth for short, 'the SSB') through the district administration in the year 2011 for the construction of its headquarter at East Champaran.

4. The claim of the petitioner is that though 80 per cent of the amount was paid, for twenty per cent, the farmers had to move from pillar to post without any payment forcing him to file this writ petition.

5. Though the Union of India has filed affidavit submitting that amount has been handed over to the State respondent, there is no counter affidavit on behalf of the State.

6. Ms. Mazumdar, has taken this Court to similar situate case of Braj Kishor Singh vs State of Bihar and Ors. (CWJC No.22472 of 2018) and submits that the writ petition be



disposed of in the same line.

7. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of following the order passed on 04.11.2025 in the case of Braj Kishore Singh (supra) as follows:

(i) if the payment of twenty per cent has been made to the petitioner, no further step is to be taken;

(ii) if the payment has not been made, the district administration is duty-bound to pay the amount by 31.12.2025;

(iii) if the payment has not been made and still not cleared by 31.12.2025, an interest of nine per cent is to be calculated with the pending twenty per cent amount till the actual payment is made.

(iv) the responsibility be fixed on the official who delayed the payment of amount and the said extra amount of nine per cent interest shall be realized from the pocket of the said official;

(v) if the payment has not been paid and the district administration fails to pay by



31st January, 2026, the petitioner shall be entitled to a cost of Rs. 10,000/- along with the nine per cent interest which has already been ordered in the present case.

8. Let a copy of the order be sent to the office of Collector, East Champaran, Motihari for his perusal and necessary action.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

