

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4103 of 2015

1. Geeta Devi Wife of Late Dinesh Rai.
2. Sonia Devi. Wife of Late Ram Briksh Rai. Both resident of village - Jitwararapur, P.O.- Indrawara, P.S.- Tazpur, District - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Samastipur.
4. The Circle Officer, Tazpur, Samastipur.
5. The Block Development Officer Tazpur, Samastipur.
6. The Dy. Collector Land Reform, Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Krishna Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sadanand Paswan, GP-29

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 01-07-2025 Heard Mr. Krishna Kant Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioners and the State.

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

*(i) for issuance of writ in the nature of
'Certiorari' for quashing the order dated
26.07.2014 passed by the District
Magistrate, Samastipur in Misc. Case No.
04/14 whereby the claim of the petitioner
which was considered in view of the*



direction dated 19.02.2014 passed by this Hon'ble Court in CWJC No. 733/14 has been rejected on erroneous ground;

(ii) to pay the compensation of the land acquired at the prevalent market rate for the land being used for the construction of 4-lane connecting link road of National Highway No. 3/828 which runs through Chaklashahi (Tazpur,Samastipur) and to direct respondents to pay the just compensation as per the rules and regulation and the nature and value of land as also taking into account that other have been paid more than what has been offered to the petitioner;

(iii) to grant any other relief/reliefs to which entitled the petitioners are entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.

3. Pursuant to the order passed by Patna High Court in C.W.J.C. No. 733 of 2014 dated 19.02.2014, the petitioners' case was taken up by the Collector (Misc. Case No. 04 of 2014 Dinesh Rai and others vs. the State & Anr.) and the claim for



enhancement of the amount was negated directing them to receive compensation as per the Award (Annexure-2 to the writ petition).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners after some argument submit that he has no knowledge whether the payment has been taken or not. However, if aggrieved, the same will be challenged before appropriate Court in accordance with law.

5. Granting said liberty, the writ petition is disposed of.

6. If the petition is preferred within four weeks from today, the Court concerned shall take into account the fact that the writ petition was pending before this Court for last ten years while deciding the limitation petition.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

