IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.1251 of 2024
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2206 of 2022

CNR No. BRHC011228752024

==========

1. Arun Kumar Son of Late Jaya Narayan, Permanent resident of Village- Ahraon, P.O. and P.S.- Sasaram, District- Rohtas and at present resident of Road No-1 (Ext.), Rajbanshi Nagar, P.O. and P.S.- Shastri Nagar, Patna- 800023.
2. Pramod Kumar, son of Late Raj Narayan, Permanent resident of Village- Ahraon, P.O. and P.S.- Sasaram, District- Rohtas and at present resident of Flat No- 01, Block- 29, Alaknanda Alok Vihar, Ghorabanda, P.O.- Telco Works, P.S.- Gobindpur, Jamshedpur- 8310004, Jharkhand.

... ... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principle Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Patna, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The General Manager, East Central Railway, Hajipur, Bihar.
5. The D.R.M., East Central Railway, Danapur, Patna.
6. The D.P.O., East Central Railway, Danapur, Patna.
7. The G.M., Railway Board, Ministry of Railway, New Delhi.
8. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Rohtas at Sasaram, Bihar.
9. The Competent Authority-cum-District Land Acquisition Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram, Bihar.
10. Superintendent of Police, Rohtas, Bihar.
11. A.D.M.-cum-1st Appellate Authority, Rohtas, Bihar.
12. S.D.O., Sasaram at Rohtas, Bihar.
13. B.D.O., Sasaram, Rohtas, Bihar.
14. Circle Officer, Sasaram, Bihar.

... ... Respondent/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Dhananjay Mishra, Adv. Mr. Nilesh Kumar Nirala, Adv. Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Shiv Pratap, AC to AAG-11
For the UOI	:	Mr. Ram Tujabh Singh, CGC

==========

WEB COPY

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANA VIKRAM SINGH
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI)

4 27-10-2026 Upon hearing the learned Advocates appearing on behalf of the appellants and the respondents we do not find any illegality in the order passed by the learned Single Judge in C.W.J.C. No. 2206 of 2022.

2. It is contended by the learned Advocate for the appellants that the appellants have 1/3rd share each in the acquired property, but in the impugned order the word ‘each’ was absent.

3. We are of the view that such error could have been rectified by the learned Single Judge on mere mentioning on the basis of the pleadings of the parties. For this reason, no appeal was required to be passed.

4. Since the writ petition was disposed off directing disposal of representation dated 24.08.2021 by the respondent no. 9, we direct the respondent no. 9 to consider as to whether the appellants had 1/3rd share each in the acquired property and on such finding, the compensation amount shall be paid to each of them.

5. It is made clear that we are not endorsing any

WEB COPY

opinion with regard to the claim or share of each of the petitioners and left this matter for consideration by respondent no. 9.

6. Accordingly, this letters patent appeal is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J)

(Rana Vikram Singh, J)

Supratim/-

U			

WEB COPY