

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14638 of 2014

1. Damodar Prasad Singh S/o Late Ram Pratap Singh
2. Mulk Raj Devi W/o - Kapil Deo Singh
3. Krishna Singh S/o - Late Bindeshwari Singh
4. Raj Kumar Singh S/o - Late Chhabila Singh
5. Tej Narayan Singh S/o - Late Bindeshwari Singh
6. Vijay Singh S/o - Late Bala Singh All Serial no. 1 to 6 resident of village - Pataria , Tola - Bhagwanpur, P.S. - Jehanabad, District - Jehanabad.
7. Sumitra Devi W/o - Parma Nand Singh Resident of Nasriganj, P.S. - Danapur, District - Patna.
8. Lalita Devi W/o - Late Janardan Singh Resident of village - Sheonan, P.S. - Jehanabad, District - Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Jehanabad.
3. The Block Development Officer, Jehanabad.
4. The Circle Officer, Jehanabad.
5. The Secretary, Rural Engineering Organisation, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
6. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Engineering Organisation R.E.O., Jehanabad.
7. The Executive Engineer, Rural Engineering Organisation, Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, AC to GP-22

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

6 30-06-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ/order or
direction(s) for commanding and directing the
respondent authority to make proper*



compensation to the petitioners of Plot No. 226, Khata No. 79 and Plot No. 287, Khata No. 189 of petitioner no.-1 situated in Mauja Pataria, Plot No. 20(0), Plot No.-4 of Khata No. 24, 28 situated in Mauja- Hamid chak of petitioner no. 2, Plot No. 291, 736, 732 under Khata No. 282, 80 and 119 situated in Mauja Pataria of petitioner no.3, Plot No. 304, Khata No. 141, 139 of petitioner no. 4 situated in Mauja Pataria, Plot No. 191, 736, 732 under khata no. 287, 80, 119 of petitioner 0.5 situated in Mauja Pataria, Plot No. 1447, Khata No.-8 situated in Mauja Hamid Chak of petitioner no. 6, Plot no. 36, Khata No.-1 situated in Mauja Hamid Chak of Petitioner no. 7. Plot No. 24, Khata No. 27 situated in Mauja Hamid Chak of Petitioner no. 8 all within the Jehanabad Anchal, District- Jehanabad over which the respondents authority are construction and developing the road namely Salempur- Pataria Road under Pradhan Mantri Sarak Yojna through, Rural Engineering Organisation (R.E.O.) without giving notice to



the petitioner or without acquisition of the land of the petitioners through proper channel nor any compensation is paid to the petitioners.

(ii) For issuance of an appropriate writ / order / and direction(s) to the petitioner to pay proper compensation to the petitioners @40,000/- per decimals.

(iii) For issuance of an appropriate writ / order and direction(s) to the respondent authorization to pay further compensation @40,000/- per decimals for changing the physical feature of agricultural land of the petitioners which caused due to digging the land of the petitioners up to 8 to 10 in both sides of the flank area of the road.

(iv) For issuance of any appropriate relief or reliefs for which the petitioners are entitled.

3. The counter affidavit as also supplementary counter affidavit is on record on behalf of the respondent nos. 5 to 7.

4. As per the paragraph no.6 of the supplementary counter affidavit, it has been recorded that there has been removal of part of the role from the private land of the



petitioner. It is to be noted that the supplementary counter affidavit was filed in the year 2017 without service of copy upon the learned counsel for the petitioner namely Shivam Singh and in that background, he was in the dark about the fresh development.

5. The notice of the supplementary counter affidavit shows that only two words 'not found' has been incorporated, the author of 'not found' statement is not on record. Definitely, it hampers disposal of the case. In that background, a token cost of Rs.500/- is being imposed upon the office concerned which the office can realise from the erring assistant/clerk as it cannot be accepted that for eight years the office failed to locate learned counsel for the petitioner and today, when the case was being taken up, then only the copy was served.

6. The receipt showing payment to Mr. Shivam Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner of the aforesaid amount shall be filed in the office by Wednesday i.e. 02.07.2025.

7. In view of the fact that the grievance has been redressed, the writ petitions stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

