

Item No.12  
14.07.2025  
Court. No. 19  
Suvayan

W.P.A. 11062 of 2025

Raghupati Pradhan  
Vs.  
The Union of India & Ors.

*Mr. Ramdulal Manna*  
*Ms. Manju Manna (Dey)*  
*Mr. Sayan Mukherjee*

*...for the Petitioner.*

*Mr. Kaustav Ch. Das*

*...for the respondent no.1.*

*Mr. Rohit Das*  
*Ms. Kishwar Rahaman*  
*Ms. Sristi Roy*

*...for the respondent nos. 2 & 4.*

*Mr. Supratim Dhar, Sr. Adv.*  
*Ms. Tuli Sinha*

*...for the State.*

1. The affidavit-of-service as filed today is taken on record.
2. The grievance of the writ petitioner in the instant writ petition is non-consideration of their representation dated 29.08.2024 by the respondent no. 3/authority.
3. From the materials as placed before this Court it reveals that compensation was assessed by the respondent no. 2/authority in terms of the provision of Section 10(4) of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (hereinafter referred to as the 'said Act of 1962') for the purpose of laying the pipeline of natural gas through the land of the writ petitioner.
4. It is submitted that in the representation dated 29.08.2024 sufficient justification has been given on

the writ petitioner as to why the writ petitioner is aggrieved with the quantum of compensation as assessed by the respondent no. 2/authority.

5. Mr. Dhar, learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the respondents/State and its functionaries and Mr. Das, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the respondent nos. 2 and 4 conjointly draws attention of this Court to the provision of Section 10 of the said Act of 1962. It is submitted by Mr. Dhar and Mr. Das that the present writ petitioner has adequate alternative statutory efficacious remedy in the event they are aggrieved with the quantum of assessment of compensation as made by the respondent no. 2/authority.
6. For effective adjudication of the instant writ petition this Court at the very outset proposes to look to the provision of Section 10 of the said Act of 1962 which is quoted hereinbelow in verbatim:-

*“10. Compensation.-(1) Where in the exercise of the powers conferred by section 4, section 7 or section 8 by any person, any damage, loss or injury is sustained by any person interested in the land under which the pipeline is proposed to be, or is being, or has been laid, the Central Government, the State Government or the corporation, as the case may be, shall be liable to pay compensation to such person for such damage, loss or injury, the amount of which shall be determined by the competent authority in the first instance.*

*(2) If the amount of compensation determined by the competent authority under*

*sub-section (1) is not acceptable to either of the parties, the amount of compensation shall, on application by either of the parties to the District Judge within the limits of whose jurisdiction the land or any part thereof is situated, be determined by the District Judge.*

(3) .....

(4) .....

(5) .....”

7. On careful perusal of the provisions of Section 10 of the said Act of 1962, this Court finds sufficient justification in the submission of Mr. Dhar and Mr. Das, inasmuch as, that it is the legislative intent that in the event any land loser finds that the compensation as paid to him is inadequate, he has a right to file an application before the jurisdictional District Judge. As rightly pointed out by Mr. Dhar and Mr. Das that no material has been placed before this Court that the writ petitioner approached the jurisdictional District Judge. It is settled position of law that availability of alternative efficacious remedy is a bar for granting relief under the writ jurisdiction unless a strong case has been made out for invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction. It is also trite law that there are two well-recognized exceptions to the doctrine of exhaustion of statutory remedies. First is when the proceedings are taken before the forum under a provision of law which is ultra virus, it is open to a party aggrieved thereby to move the High Court for quashing the proceedings on the ground that they

are incompetent without a party being obliged to wait until those proceedings run their full course. Secondly, the doctrine has no application when the impugned order has been made in violation of the principles of natural justice.

8. Such view was taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the reported decision of ***U.P. State Spinning Co. Ltd. versus R. S. Pandey and Anr.*** reported in ***(2005) 8 SCC 264.***
9. Coming to the factual aspect of this Court, this Court finds that the present case of the writ petitioner do not fall within the aforementioned two exceptions as clearly indicated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
10. In view of such and on account of availability of alternative efficacious remedy, this Court considers that the instant writ petition is not at all maintainable.
11. Accordingly, the instant writ petition being WPA 11062 of 2025 is dismissed.
12. However, there will be no order as to costs.
13. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

**(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)**