

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21851 of 2018**

- 
1. Paras Yadav and Anr Son of Ram Prasad Mahto @ Nathun Mahto @ Ram Prasad Yadav, Resident of Village- Kaiya Tola, Mayapur, P.O.- Budhgere, Manpur, Buniyadganj, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Gaya.
  2. Anil Yadav, Son of Late Kedar Yadav, Resident of Village- Kaiya, Mayapur, P.O.- Budhgere, Manpur, Buniyadganj, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Competent Officer-cum-Land Acquisition Officer, Gaya.
3. The Deputy General Manager, Project in Rajgir, Nalanda.
4. The District Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Gaya.
5. The Circle Officer, Manpur, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

---

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

2      14-10-2025                      Heard the parties.

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

*commanding and restraining the respondents specially Respondent No. 3 to not make any construction of road NH-82 without acquiring the Plot No. 85 pertaining to Khata No.262, Thana No.292, having Rakba 58 decimal of Mauza Kaiya Mayapur, within the District Gaya.*

3. A counter affidavit has come on behalf of the respondent nos. 2, 3 and 5 duly signed by the Circle Officer,



Manpur, Gaya and learned State Counsel has taken this Court to paragraph 4 and 5 to show that the petitioners' land is not part of the widening of the National Highway-82 (Gaya-Hisua-Rajgir-Nalanda-Bihar Sharif) part and in that background, no case of petitioner is made out.

4. As per paragraph 5, for the widening of the NH-82, lands were required, acquisition process initiated, villages/lands of plot no. 85 of village Kaiya, Manpur, Gaya was surveyed, demarcated but the same was never published under Section 3A of the National Highway Act, 1956.

5. A counter affidavit has been filed after service of copy to the petitioner and there is no rebuttal. This Court is convinced that the land in question of the petitioner is not part of the widening of the National Highway 82.

6. In that background, granting liberty to the petitioner that if such situation arise, to agitate the matter afresh, the writ petition is disposed of.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Vijay Singh/-

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

