

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18363 of 2025

=====

Pankaj Kumar Singh Son of Late Kameshwar Prasad Singh, Resident of
Village- Bhatahan, P.S. Sheyampur Bhatahan, District- Sheohar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Land Reforms Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Arbitrator-cum-Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
3. The District Magistrate, Sheohar.
4. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Sheohar.
5. The Anchal Adhikari, Dumri Katsari Anchal, District- Sheohar.
6. The National Highway Authority of India, Patna through its Chairman.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Md. Anisur Rahman, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Government Pleader (11)
	:	Ms. Dimpal Kumari, AC to GP-11
For the NHAI	:	Mr. Gaurav Govinda, Advocate
	:	Ms. Preety Ranjan, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 31-03-2026 Heard the parties.

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

*“(i) for issuance of appropriate writ/ order
or direction quashing the order dated 15.01.2024
passed in Arbitration (Land Acquisition) case no.
86/2019 passed by the Respondent no. 2 the
Arbitrator-cum-Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut
Division, Muzaffarpur who has rejected the case
filed by the petitioner's mother (Rampari Devi)
on the ground that the petitioner did not filed
Objection petition under section-3A of the*



National Highway Act-1956 as contained in Annexure-P/7 to this writ application.

(ii) for issuance of appropriate writ/ order or direction commanding the respondents to make payment of compensation amount to the petitioner at the rate of commercial land as the land of the petitioner has been situated in commercial area.

(iii) for issuance of appropriate writ/ order or direction commanding the respondents to make payment of compensation amount at appropriate rate of the land acquired by the respondents for widening the National Highway No. 104 (Banjaria-Sheohar).

(iv) for any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled in the opinion of this Hon'ble court.”

3. The petitioner claims to be owner of piece land having Khata No.273, Khesra No.2913/3424 (area 0.030 hectare) and Khata No. 274, Khesra No. 3380 (area 0.004 hectare) in the village-Bhathan, Circle-Dumri Katsari, District-Sheohar.

4. The land in question was taken over for the



widening of the National Highway-104 (Banjaria-Sheohar) and accordingly notification issued relating to land acquisition case no. 01 of 2014-15 by the office of the District Land Acquisition Officer, Sheohar. The land of the petitioner was put in the category of agricultural land.

5. Five years later, being aggrieved by the said categorization, the mother of the petitioner, Rampari Devi moved before the Arbitrator-cum-Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur in Arbitration Case No. 86 of 2019 (Rampari Devi vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.). It was taken up on 15.01.2024 and the Arbitrator came to the conclusion that though the claim has been made for treating it as a commercial land, no document was produced to support the said claim.

6. It further recorded that after the notification was issued, there was no objection from the petitioner/family members whereafter it was categorized as agricultural land and accordingly payments made.

7. In that background, the claim of the petitioner's family was negated with the direction to the District Land Acquisition Officer, Sheohar to move ahead in the matter.

8. Aggrieved, the present writ petition.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that only because of delay, an order has been passed and needs to be



quashed.

10. Learned State counsel as also learned counsel representing 'the NHAI' refutes the same and has taken this Court to the order dated 15.01.2024 to submit that it is a reasoned order and the Arbitrator-cum-Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur has taken note of the entire facts and came to the conclusion that no document/evidence has come forward to support the claim and accordingly, rejected the claim which needs no interference.

11. This Court has taken note of the entire facts and is in conformity with the submissions put forward by the learned counsel for the State as also 'the NHAI'. The petitioner/family members have definitely missed the bus. No further point has been put forward by the petitioner to show that anyone in the vicinity and/those closed to his land have been treated differently.

12. In that background, no relief can be extended to the petitioner. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U			
---	--	--	--

