

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19336 of 2025

=====

Surendra Dutt Pandey son of Vidyanand Dutt Pandey, resident of Village-
Raghunathpur, P.S. Turkauliya, District East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Land Acquisition, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Chairman Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Authority, Muzaffarpur.
4. The District Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari.
5. The District Land Acquisition Officer, East Champaran at Motihari.
6. Rajesh Kumar Srivastava, son of Late Dakshina Murti, resident of village- Belbanwa, Atal Dwar, Professor colony in front of Police Club, Police Station- Motihari, District- Motihari.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shakti Suman Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Standing Counsel (23)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 01-12-2025 Heard the parties.

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

*“for quashing of order dated
11/03/2025 (as contained in annexure-P/8)
passed by the Presiding Officer, Land
Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement
Authority, Muzaffarpur (hereinafter referred to
as the Authority) in L.A. Case no. 11 of 2020*



(Motihari) whereby and where under learned Authority, Muzaffarpur in an perverse manner rejected intervenor petition dated 27/06/2023 filed by the petitioner to implead him as party in ongoing L.A. Case No. 11/2020 arising out of Land Acquisition Case no. 6/2013-14 as being the owner of piece of land situated at Mauja-Bankat, Khesra no. 797 and 798 under Khata no. 7 having area about 4 katha, he has sufficient interest in the matter.”

3. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Authority, Muzaffarpur (henceforth for short ‘the LARRA’) in L.A. Case No. 11 of 2020 (Motihari) dated 11.03.2025 (Annexure P/8 to the petition) by which after holding that the proposed intervener should have preferred an application under section 64 and 76 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency Act in which under Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, the petition dated 25.01.2020 was rejected.

4. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be given liberty to act in



accordance with the advice given by ‘the LARRA’,
Muzaffarpur.

5. Learned State counsel has no objection.

6. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of,
allowing the petitioner to act in accordance with the comments
made by ‘the LARRA’, Muzaffarpur as recorded above.

7. Needless to add, if such petition is filed, the same
shall be taken into consideration alongwith such cases pending
relating to the said land.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

