

Court No. 19
(265719)

11.03.2026
(AD 4)
(S. Banerjee)

WPA 4211 of 2026

Pintu Kumar Midya & Ors.
Vs.
The Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Bhagabat Chowdhury
Mr. Subrata Mukherjee

...for the petitioners

Mr. Shiv Chandra Prasad

...for the Union of India

Ms. Biswanath Chatterjee
Ms. Sayonee Bera
Mr. S. Kumar Pathak

...for the respondent nos. 2 to 4 and 8

Affidavit of service filed in Court today, is taken
on record.

Petitioners claim to be the owners of plots of
land which have been acquired for the purpose of
laying of pipelines under Haldia – Panagarh Pipeline
Project. Petitioners raised an objection against laying
of such pipeline through their property. Alleging
inaction on the part of the respondent authorities,
petitioners have approached this Court.

Learned advocate appearing for the respondent-
Corporation submits that the compensation for the
area under right of user has already been determined.

In support of such contention he draws the attention of the Court to page 50 of the writ petition.

Mr. Chowdhury, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that the compensation determined by the competent authority is not acceptable to the petitioners for which the petitioners have served a letter demanding justice. He prays for a direction upon the competent authority to consider the same.

Learned advocate appearing for the Corporation places reliance upon the provisions laid down under Section 10 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines Act, 1962 and submits that a person aggrieved by the determination of the compensation has to approach the District Judge under Section 10(2) of the 1962 Act.

Learned advocate appearing for the respondent-Corporation further submits that the period of limitation for preferring an application before the District Judge is 90 days from the date of receipt of intimation from the competent authority.

Faced with such situation, Mr. Chowdhury, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners prays for leave to withdraw this writ petition with liberty to

approach the learned District Judge under Section 10(2) of the 1962 Act.

In the light of the submissions made by the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties, this writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioners to apply before the District Judge under Section 10(2) of the 1962 Act in accordance with law.

(Hiranmay Bhattacharyya, J.)