

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19950 of 2018

=====

Dadan Singh Son of Nemi Singh R/o Mauza-Chikni, Ward No.1, P.O.-
Jokiyari, P.S.- Raxaul, District-East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar,
Patna
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Home, Bihar, Patna
4. The Director, Land Acquisition, Bihar, Patna
5. The Joint Secretary, Department of Home, Bihar, Patna
6. The Collector, Motihari
7. The Land Acquisition Officer, Motihari
9. The Secretary, Border Management Ministry of Home Affairs, Government
of India, North Block, New Delhi.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Mallika Mazumdar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Raj Kishore Roy- GP-18
For the UOI	:	Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Pandey, Sr. CGC
		Mr. R.K. Sharma, CGC
		Mr. Lokesh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 01-12-2025 Heard Ms. Mallika Mazumdar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and the State as also the Union of India.

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

*“That this writ of Mandamus is upon the
Respondent authorities for a direction for payment of
of the money to the farmers whose land have been
acquired in 2011 by S.S.B. (Seema Surkhsa Bal) for
Construction of its Head Quarters in Mauza Chikni,
District E. Champaran. And the entire compensation*



money has not been paid to farmers. The rest money should be paid with interest amount. That the remaining amount should be paid as per new Act.”

3. Earlier, the District Land Acquisition Officer, East Champaran, Motihari filed an affidavit stating that the farmers whose land have been acquired in 2011 for the construction of Headquarters of S.S.B., all the payments have not been made.

4. On the last occasion, this Court wanted Mrs. Surekha Kumari, learned State counsel to inform whether the remaining 20% amount has been paid or not.

5. Today, on call, learned State counsel submits that she had telephonic conversation and according to the information, the payments have been made in the year 2020 itself.

6. In that background, when the entire payments have been made, the writ petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

7. However, if the contention made by the State is incorrect, the petitioner will have the liberty to revive the petition by filing an Interlocutory Petition.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

