

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6687 of 2015

=====

Nanhaku Yadav Son of Late Ganpat Yadav Resident of village- Nariya Tola,
Mohan Bigha, P.S.- Sigori, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Director, Land Acquisition, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector, Jehanabad.
4. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Jehanabad.
5. Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Limited through its Managing Director, Patna.
6. The Senior Project Engineer, Works Division No. 1, Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Limit

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None.
For the State	:	Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Singh, AAG-13
For the Pul Nigam	:	Mr. P.K. Shahi, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Md. Nadim Seraj, Advocate
		Md. Afhan Akhtar, Advocate
		Dr. Anand Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Rajan Prakash, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 08-07-2025 No one appears on behalf of the petitioners though

learned counsel for the State as also learned counsels for Pul

Nirman Nigam are present.

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

*(i) for a direction upon the respondents
especially to the authorities of Bihar State
Bridge construction corporation limited,*



Patna to consider case of petitioner in view of the fact that 50 decimals land of petitioner situated in Mauza Jamalpur Dhuriya under Panchayat Jamuk, PS, Anchal and District -Jehanabad, appertaining to Khata No.45/8 plot no.2/2 and Khata No.46/8. Khesra No.4/3 is being forcibly acquired for construction of Road Bridge (Chikasi Path over Gandhar River) without making acquisition of land and without providing him compensation;

(ii) for other order/orders direction/directions to which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and circumstances of the instant case.

3. Dr. Anand Kumar has taken this Court to paragraphs 8, 9 and 10 to show that on behalf of the villagers, the then MLA gave consent for construction of the bridge without any demand for the compensation. Thereafter, the process took place and the construction of the bridge has already stands completed. The further averment is that the petitioner during entire construction which stands completed, never raised



any objection.

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

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U			
---	--	--	--

