

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.24211 of 2018

=====

Suresh Sao S/o Late Mangal Sao Resident of Mohalla Nalapar Chowk
Shikarpur,PS Chaowk, PO Ghauganj,Patna City,Dist.Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary,Revenue
Department,Land Reforms,Bihar,Patna
2. The Collector(District Magistrarte) Bihar,Patna
3. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Bihar,Patna
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms,Patna City,Patna
5. The Circle Officer, at Gandhi Maidan,Patna,Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bishwa Nath Upadhyay, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, GP-14

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-01-2026 Heard Ms. Anjali Kumari, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, learned GP-14.

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

*(i) For issuance of an appropriate
Writ/s, Order/s, Direction/s, directing the
respondents to pay the dues of land
compensation benefit to the petitioner
immediately without demur.*

*(ii) For issuance of a Writ of
Mandamus, commanding the respondents to
make payment of dues to the petitioner of
land compensation without delay at once.*

(iii) Any other relief or reliefs be



granted to the petitioner for which he is found entitled in the facts as well as in law.

3. The compensation amount of Rs. 8,39,350/- which included the structure on the land was calculated and after 10% I.T. deduction, Rs. 7,55,415 was paid on 01.08.2014. After the payment of aforesaid 80% amount, the remaining 20% amount was calculated as Rs. 2,64,266 and after 10% of I.T. deduction, Rs. 2,37,839/- was paid on 03.03.2016. The eighty per cent amount that was received by the petitioner, Suresh Sao of Rs. 7,55,415/- is part of the counter affidavit as Annexure A. Again, so far as Rs. 2,37,839/- is concerned, the record shows that it was paid in the bank account of in the year 2016.

4. The prayer in the writ petition clearly shows that he wanted payment and there is nothing on record to show that he is aggrieved by the calculation and/or the award that has been made.

5. It seems certain people, namely, Jay Prakash Sah and Shambhu Sah had earlier made objections which led to payment of eighty per cent but later twenty per cent has also been released in favour of the petitioner, Suresh Sao.

6. In that background, in the opinion of the Court, nothing remains. If the petitioner is still aggrieved, he can very well move before an appropriate authority/Court but so far as



payment part is concerned, pursuant to the award, the record shows that the same has been paid.

7. In that background, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

