

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9535 of 2016

=====

Ram Beyash Paneri Son of Late Ram Ken Paneri, Resident of village-
Mubarakpur, P.S. Mohaniya, District- Kaimur Bhabhua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India
2. The Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways Govt of India, New Delhi.
3. The National Highway Authority of India through its Chairman-Cum-Secretary, Ministry of Shipping R
4. The Project Director, National Highway Authority, D.I.G.Colony Maqbul Alam Road, Varanashi U.P.
5. The District Land Acquisition Officer-Cum- Competent Authority, Bhabhua
6. The Additional Collector-cum- Arbitrator, Bhabhua.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the State	:	Smt. Binita Singh, SC-28
For the NHAI	:	Dr. Maurya Vijay Chandra, Advocate
	:	Mr. Gaurav Govinda, Advocate
	:	Ms. Preeti Ranjan, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 08-09-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though

the State as also the National Highway Authority of India are

present.

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

*“for issuance of appropriate
writ/order/direction/(s) to the respondent
authorities for setting aside the Order dated
23.05.2015 passed by Arbitrator, Bhabhua in
Case No. 241/2014-15, whereby and where*



under the petitioner has been arbitrarily deprived from the adequate compensation of land acquired by Central Government under National Highway Authority Act 1950 contrary to their own finding and arbitrarily discretion in evaluating the land valuation which is prima-facie evident from their order, which renders the instant order liable to be vitiated.

And/Or pass such order/s which the Hon'ble court thinks the petitioner is entitled for.”

3. Learned counsels jointly submits that the Arbitrator-cum-Additional Collector, Kaimur at Bhabhua has already passed an order and the petitioner has to move before the competent Civil Court under section 34 of the Arbitration and Reconciliation Act, 1996.

4. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance, the writ petition stands dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

