

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18346 of 2016

=====

Priyadarshi Ambrish S/o Sri Mahendra Kumar resident of Village- Pathra,
Police Station- Tankuppa, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Home Secretary, State of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
4. The Collector cum District Magistrate, Gaya.
5. The Additional Collector cum District Magistrate, Gaya.
6. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Gaya.
7. The Circle Officer, Tankuppa Block, District- Gaya.
8. The Block Development Officer, Tankuppa Block, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Dhirendra Pratap Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar Mandal, SC-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 05-08-2025 Heard Mr. Kumar Dhirendra Pratap Singh, 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(s), order(s),
direction(s) in the nature of Certiorari or
any appropriate writ to set aside the letter
no. comp 01, dated 27.06.2015 by which the
Circle Officer, Tankuppa Block, Gaya
informed to the petitioner that in compliance*



of the order dated 24.06.2014 passed by Hon'ble High Court, Patna in CWJC No. 2566/2012 cheque of Rs. 10,006-00 has been issued as compensation for his land acquired under section 23 of the Ceiling Act and take notice to receive cheque from Tankuppa Block;

(ii) for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the respondents to give proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and then adjudicate adequate and reasonable compensation of the lands of petitioner acquired as surplus land under alleged ceiling act as per valuation of the land when compensation is adjudicated and compensation paid to the petitioner;

(iii) for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing respondents to pay adequate compensation for depriving petitioner from enjoyment of his 35.49 acres land which was



released in his favour in 1994 and right to enjoy the usufructs of his said land crystallized in 1994 but due to acts of deliberate omissions on the part of respondents to demarcate and restore physical possession of the said released land, the petitioner has been denied the benefit of his land and his legal right of enjoyment of his land despite dear judicial direction of this Hon'ble Court;

(iv) for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus of any other appropriate writ directing respondents to pay adequate compensation to the petitioner for unnecessary court cases and trouble created by the acts and omissions of the respondents;

(v) for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing respondents to be reasonable and act like role model in the matter of adjudicating compensation and not to



deprive the petitioner from his valuable property without adequately compensating the petitioner;

(vi) for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus of unto proper compensation as per the present prevailing rates (fixed by the government for the registry purposes) to the petitioner against the 18.53 acres of land which has been finally acquired by them in final acquisition along with 18% per annum as penal interest till the actual payment.

3. The claim of the petitioner is that earlier pursuant to the order passed in C.W.J.C. No. 2566 of 2012, the amount was different, later request has been made to receive a curtailed amount.

4. Learned State counsel submits that in case, the same has happened, the petitioner should have received the same and could have approached the appropriate forum, the Arbitrator cum Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he shall be approaching the Arbitrator in next four weeks.



6. In case, the said petition is preferred in four weeks, the Arbitrator cum Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya shall be noticing the parties and passing the final order at an earliest.

7. The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

