

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7632 of 2023

=====

Dinesh Sah son of Late Sukhdeo Sah, Resident of Jadia, Police Station-Jadia,
District-Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Land Acquisition Directorate, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Supaul.
4. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Supaul.
5. The District Public Complaint Redressal Officer, Supaul.
6. The Circle Officer, Triveniganj, District-Supaul.
7. Union of India, New Delhi, Construction of Supaul Araria New Rail Line Pariyojna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Raj Kishore Roy (Gp18)
For UOI	:	Mr. Anwar Karim, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 10-03-2026

Heard Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Vivekand Singh, learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for grant of following
relief:-

*“1. That this application is being filed
for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus
direction to respondents authority concern to
pay compensation amount to the petitioner
against the land bearing Khata No.405 Old 1136
New Khesra No.2790 Old 2569 New Area 38*



decimal situated at Mauza -Jadia, Chadar No.02, Thana No.299, Anchal -Triveniganj, District-Supaul by declaring the land commercial in place of agricultural which was acquitted by the State of Bhar for the purpose of construction of Supaul Araria New Rail Line Pariyojna and any other appropriate order, direction save and except in accordance with law.”

3. From the Supaul Araria New Railway Line Project, the land of the petitioner (Khesra No.2790 area 33.200) was acquired. The Award was prepared putting the land in agricultural category.

4. Aggrieved, the present petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there are residential buildings, school, shops and as such it could not be categorized as agricultural.

6. A counter affidavit has come on behalf of the State respondents duly signed by the District Land Acquisition Officer, Supaul and they have come up with preliminary objection that under Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as ‘LARA), the statutory remedy is available to the petitioner under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.



7. This Court is also of the view that the petitioner should approach the concerned authority.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he shall take appropriate steps and approaching the concerned authority in next 8 weeks.

9. If such petition is filed, the Authority shall look into the matter and after noticing the parties, shall be taking the matter to its logical conclusion expeditiously in accordance with law keeping in mind that the writ petition was pending before this Court for the last three years while dealing with delay in filing the petition.

sanjeev/-

(Rajiv Roy, J)

