IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.5430 of 2019
In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10549 of 2019

CNR No. BRHC011354592019

==========

1. Anil Kumar S/o Late Vashishth Narayan Verma Resident of Village- Zuneda, P.S.- Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur, At present resident of Indrapuri Colony, Road No. 02, Mithunpura, P.O.- Ramna, P.S.- Mithunpura, District- Muzaffarpur.
2. Sanjay Kumar Son of Late Surendra Kumar Resident of Village- Zuneda, P.S.- Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur, At present resident of quarter No. 356/B, DLW Colony, P.S.- Maduadih, District- Vanarshi (U.P.)

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. Mr. Chandra Gupta Ashok Vandhan Principal Secretary Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Mr. Jai Singh, The Director, Revenue and Land Reforms Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. Mr. Devendra Kumar Verma, The Director, Land Acquisition, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. Mr. Bhawaninandan, The Engineer in Chief, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. Mr. Ramavtar Sah, Chief Engineer, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
6. Mr. Alok Ranjan Ghosh, The Collector, Muzaffarpur.
7. Mr. Md. Umair, The District Land Acquisition Officer, Muzaffarpur.
8. Mr. Dinanath Prasad, The Superintending Engineer, Road Construction Department, Muzaffarpur.
9. Mr. Arun Kumar, The Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Muzaffarpur.

... ... Opposite Parties

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioners : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Shrivastava, Advocate
For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Arvind Kumar, GP19

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL ORDER

7 04-11-2026 **1.** The present Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case is filed for non-compliance of the order of this

WEB COPY

court dated 09.05.2019.

2. This Court had directed the District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur, may first examine the claims of the petitioners and, if he comes to the conclusion that the land of the petitioners was not acquired, they were to be paid compensation in lieu of use of their land and then he is required to see the compensation in terms of the 2013 Land Acquisition Act to be paid to the petitioners or to restore back the possession of the land of the petitioners immediately.

3. A show-cause as well as a supplementary show-cause has been filed on behalf of the opposite parties. The contents of paragraph 10 of the supplementary show-cause clearly disclose that the final payment has been fully institutionalized, disbursed and cleared through the RTGS mechanism, the details of which are as follows:-

> ***"****(i). To Petitioner No. 1 (Anil Kumar): A total sum of Rs. 40,03,408.00 was paid via Voucher/Transaction ID No. 251211122400014449. The voucher was cleared, marked as PAID & CANCELLED,*

WEB COPY

and finalized on 09.12.2025.

(ii). To the Co-Sharer / Legal Heir of the Petitioner's Lineage (Aruna Sinha / Surendra Kumar Verma lineage): The corresponding share of Rs. 40,03,407.00 was similarly executed and closed 09.12.2025.

A cumulative amount of Rs. 80,06,815.00 (Rupees Eighty Lakhs Six Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifteen only) stands fully discharged by the office of the District Land Acquisition Officer, Muzaffarpur.”

4. A rejoinder has been filed by the petitioner. The contents of the rejoinder disclose that, as verified from Annexure-5 of the supplementary show-cause, a part of the land in Survey Plot No. 68, measuring an area of 0.0225, is mentioned as “residential” in the classification column, which was sold by the father of petitioner No. 1. However, in the same Khatiyan and in the same Survey Plot No. 68, the classification of the land of the petitioner, measuring an area of 0.4225, is mentioned as “developing land”, although both pieces of land are situated adjacent to each other. The basis on which the opposite parties have classified one part of the land as residential and the other as developing land has

WEB COPY

not been explained. Therefore, the Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that proper compensation has not been granted to the petitioners and that they are entitled to further compensation.

5. Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the Learned counsel for the opposite parties.

6. If at all the petitioners are aggrieved by the quantum of compensation paid to them, and also of the classification of land as residential and developing land, they are at liberty to make a representation before the Land Acquisition Officer, raising their grievances by way of a Protest Petition.

7. As far as the order of this Court is concerned, it appears that compensation has already been disbursed to the petitioners. In view of the compliance of the order, the contempt proceedings are hereby dropped, granting liberty to the petitioners to avail the remedies available to them, in accordance with law, before the

WEB COPY

appropriate authority.

8. with the above said observation, the contempt petition is hereby closed.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Shanu/-

U			

WEB COPY