

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16620 of 2025

1. Naresh Ravidas son of Bodhi Ravidas, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S.-Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.
2. Pramod Das, son of Jagrup Das, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S. Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.
3. Dhan Pat Das @ Dhanpat Ravidas son of Nathuni Das, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S.- Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.
4. Bharat Das, son of Ramyatan Das, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S.- Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.
5. Jitendra Kumar, son of Chhotan Choudhary, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S.-Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.
6. Ram Ratan Paswan, son of Ganauri Paswan, resident of Naudiha, P.O-Naudhia, P.S.-Khizersarai, District-Gaya, Bihar-824233.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Revenue Land and Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Land and Reforms Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gayaji.
4. The District Magistrate, Gayaji.
5. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Gayaji.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Ninchak Bathani, Gayaji.
7. The Circle Officer, Khizersarai, Gayaji.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sumit Kumar Jha, Advocate Mrs. Rakchika Shekhar, Advocate Ms. Riya Giri, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Birju Prasad, GP-13 Mrs. Shweta Anand, AC to GP-13

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 11-11-2025 Heard the parties.

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



“i. To issue writ/order or direction in the nature of mandamus for a direction to the respondent authorities to grant compensation to the petitioners in accordance with the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

ii. To declare that the petitioners are entitled for the compensation in accordance with the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

iii. To hold and declare that the action of the respondent authorities by taking possession of the petitioners without making any payment of compensation is in accordance with the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 is illegal, arbitrary and perverse and also violative of Article 300 A of the Constitution of India.

iv. To any other relief or reliefs for which



the petitioners are found to be entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, after some arguments, submit that fresh petition alongwith all the supporting document will be filed separately by all the six petitioners before the Collector, Gayaji (respondent no. 4) for the redressal of their grievances.

4. Learned State counsel submits that if such separate petitions are filed, after inquiry/hearing them, it will be taken to the logical conclusion.

5. Considering the submissions of the parties as also the *bona fide* claim put forward by the petitioners, the same is disposed of allowing them to file separate petition before the Collector, Gayaji who shall be putting all concerned on notice and after inquiry/hearing the parties, shall be taking the matter to its logical conclusion preferably by 30.06.2026.

6. The writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

