

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11755 of 2024

Madhusudan Sharma Son of Late Basudev Sharma, resident of Village- Dehuni, P.S.- Ghoshi, Anchal- Ghoshi, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Administrative Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Jehanabad.
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Jehanabad.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Jehanabad.
5. The Circle Officer, Ghoshi, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Tiwary
For the Respondent/s : AC to SC-8

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 04-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
AC to SC-8.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the land in dispute in the instant writ application was acquired for Bharat Mala Project four lane. It is next submitted that after acquisition, compensation was awarded under Section 3G of National Highways Act, 1956, but then the petitioner did not appear to receive the compensation, as such the compensation amount was deposited with Principal Civil Court, Jehanabad on 22-9-2023. It is further submitted that petitioner can collect the compensation amount from the Principal Civil Court, Jehanabad, in accordance with law.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not dispute the said submission of the learned



State counsel, but then submits that he has not got the compensation for the reason that his family members/other claimants are not giving no objection, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that it appears that the dispute is in between the family members and until and unless all the legal claimants give their no objection, the amount cannot be disbursed, it is also submitted that for the said purpose, petitioner will have to seek his remedy in accordance with law before an appropriate forum.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to entertain the writ application any further. Accordingly, the writ application is dismissed.

6. However, the dismissal of the writ application will not preclude the petitioner from receiving the amount of compensation in accordance with law after completing all the formalities required.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

