

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5975 of 2017

=====

Sabita Devi Wife of Sri Dhrub Kumar, resident of Village Kanhauli, Police Station Kanhauli, District Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Collector, Sitamarhi, Bihar
3. The AdditionalCollector-cum-Arbitrator, Sitamarhi, Bihar,
4. The Land Acquisition Officer, Sitamarhi, Bihar
5. The Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways, Govt. of India,
6. The Director, National Highway Authority, New Delhi.
7. The Project Director, National Highway No. 77, Muzaffarpur, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ajay Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Raj Kishore Roy, G.P-18
For NHA	:	Dr. Maurya Vijay Chandra, Advocate
		Mr. Gautam Govinda, Advocate
		Ms. Ankita Kumari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 02-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the State and National Highway Authority of India.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the following relief/s:

(i) for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 10.02.2017, passed by the Respondent No. 3 in Arbitration Miscellaneous Case No. 12 of 2014-15, whereby the Respondent No. 3 vide



order dated 10.02.2017 has rejected the Arbitration Miscellaneous Case No. 12 of 2014-2015, filed by the petitioner against wrong classification and payment of inadequate compensation for her land acquired for widening/constructing four lane of National Highway No. 77;

(ii) for issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus commanding the Respondent to re-classify the land of the petitioner as commercial situated on Highway/Main Road and to pay compensation accordingly;

(iii) for issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order/orders and/or direction/directions to which the petitioner is found entitled.

3. The Arbitrator has passed the order and in that background, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he shall be approaching the competent Court for the redressal of the grievance under section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. However, there has been delay as the matter was pending before this Court.



4. If the petition is preferred in eight weeks, the competent Court shall see to it that the matter was pending before this Court since 2017 while deciding the limitation petition.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

