

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11666 of 2022

- 1.1. Bashisth Kumar Thakur Son of late Kashinath Thakur, Resident of Village - Mahammadpur, P.O. - Mahammadpur, District- Gopalganj.
- 1.2. Anil Kumar Son of Late Kashinath Thakur, Resident of Village - Mahammadpur, P.O. - Mahammadpur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principle Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector Gopalganj, District-Gopalganj.
3. The Land Acquisition Officer, Gopalganj, District-Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akhilesh Kumar, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Raj Kishore Roy (Gp 18)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 23-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief:

“ This writ application is being filed for issuance of appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for quashing the order contained in letter no. 616 dated 16.7.2018 (Annexure-3) issued by the respondent Colector Gopalganj whereby and whereunder he refused to reconsider the amount of compensation and has rejected the objection of the petitioner and further prays for a direction to the concerned Respondent



authorities for making equal payment of amount to the compensation payable to the for his land bearing Khata No. 459, Khesra No. 2023, Area 4.75 dismil situated in village Mohamadpur, which has been acquired by the Respondent authorities for extension of State Highway 90 and the total compensation amount of the petitioner's land was fixed and paid Rs. 17,46,052/- vide award no. 17, whereas from the same plot i.e. plot no. 2023, Khata No. 459, 3 dismil land belonging to one Co-sharer namely Lal Babu Thakur has been acquired vide award no. 15 & 18 in Land Acquisition Case No. 4/2012-2013 and compensation amount has been fixed and paid by the Respondent authorities at the rate of Rs. 11,97,572/- per dismil. The petitioner further prays for any other relief (s) for which, he is found entitled in the eye of law.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not been paid adequate compensation.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that if the petitioner is not satisfied with the compensation amount, there is an alternative remedy available to the petitioner.

5. In view of the above, I am of the considered view that there is an alternative remedy available to the petitioner.



The petitioner may file appeal before the Appellate authorities.

“ In light of these observations, this writ petition is disposed of. The concerned Appellate Authority is directed to decide the petitioner’s appeal within three months of its filing.”

(Alok Kumar, J)

Anand/-

U			
---	--	--	--

