

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17227 of 2017**

=====

Shashi Bhushan Kumar Son of Lalan Kumar Prasad @ Lalan Singh, resident  
of Village- Bajitpur, P.O. Lagma, P.S. Dumra, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India
2. The Chairman, Railway Board, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
3. The Secretary, Department of Railway, Rail Bhawan, New Delhi.
4. The General Manager, East Central Railway, Zonal Office, Hajipur, District-  
Vaishali.
5. The Divisional Railway, Manager Samastipur, East Central Railway,  
District- Samastipur.
6. The Deputy Chief Engineer Construction, East Central Railway, Samastipur.
7. The State of Bihar.
8. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
9. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : None  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      17-06-2025                      No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though  
  
learned counsel for the State is present.

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

*“That this is an application for issuance  
of an appropriate Writ, Order or direction to the  
concerned respondent for providing employment in  
the Railways on any appropriate Post on account  
of acquisition of his land by the State Government  
for the use of the respondent Railways for the*



*purpose of construction of "Muzaffarpur-Sitamarhi Rail Line" on the basis of the circular issued by the Govt. of India, Ministry of Railways vide Circular no. 3 (NG) 11/89/RC-2/38 dated 10.11.1989 which inter alia, provides for employment of one person in the family displaced as a result of acquisition of land on certain conditions as well as on the basis of the order of the Apex Court passed in this regard and the petitioner further prays to grant any other relief/reliefs as to Hon'ble Court may think fit and proper under the circumstances of the case."*

3. The State counsel has pointed out that a belated petition has been filed, the land acquisition proceeding having taken place in the year 1989.

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

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Adnan/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

