

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2808 of 2017

=====

Jang Bahadur Singh Son of Late Paramhans Singh Resident of Village - Barej, P.O. - Kauree Ram, P.S. Mohaniya, District Kaimur, Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India
2. The Deputy Secretary, Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
3. The National Highways Authority of India through its Chairman-cum-Secretary, Ministry of Shipping R
4. The Project Director, National Highway Authority, Sasaram, Bihar.
5. The District Land Acquisition Officer-cum-Competent Authority, Kaimur at Bhabua.
6. The Additional Collector-cum-Arbitration, Kaimur at Bhabua.
7. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the State	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14
For the NHAI	:	Mr. Dr. Maurya Vijay Chandra, Advocate
	:	Mr. Gaurav Govinda, Advocate
	:	Ms. Preety Ranjan, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 16-02-2026 No one appears on behalf of the petitioner though learned State counsel as also learned counsel representing the National Highway Authority of India are present.

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

“for setting aside the order dated

21.03.2015 passed in Misc. Case No. 313/2014-

15 by the Additional Collector-cum-Arbitrator,



Kaimur at Bhabhua whereby and where under the learned Arbitrator has rejected the claim of the petitioner to calculate the value of acquired land in dispute at the rate of commercial in place of residential and/or pass such any other order/orders which the court thinks the petitioner entitled for.”

3. Learned State counsel submits that the order dated 21.03.2015 passed by the Additional Collector-cum-Arbitrator, Kaimur at Bhabhua in Misc. Case No. 313 of 2014-15 (Jangbahadur Singh and Ors. vs. National Highway Authority of India & Ors.) by which the demand of categorization of the land of the petitioner was negated.

4. The submission is that against the said order, the petitioner ought to have move before an appropriate court/authority instead of filing the writ petition.

5. Be that as it may, since there is no appearance, the writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

