

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6470 of 2026

Ford Hospital and Research Center Private Limited registered under company Act having Registration Authority entirely ID U85119BR2007 P5C012958 a Private Limited Company (en) - YSPA located at New By Pass Road (NH 30) Khemnichak, Jaganpura, PS Ramkrishna Nagar, District Patna 800027, IN - BR India through its one of Director namely Dr. Santosh Kumar (M) aged about years, son of Harendra Kumar, House No G/45 resident of Village P.C. Colony, Kankarbagh, PS - Kankarbagh District - Patna (Bihar)-800020.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reform, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Urban and House, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Directorate of Land Acquisition, Department of Revenue and Land Reform, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate cum Collector, Patna.
5. The Additional Collector, Patna.
6. The District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna.
7. The Circle Officer, Circle Phulwarisharif, (Patna).
8. The Managing Director, Patna Metro Rail Corporation Limited, its Head Office at Indira Bhawan, West Boring Road, Sri Krishnapuri, Patna, Bihar.
9. The Director, Patna Metro Rail Corporation Limited, its Head Office at Indira Bhawan, West Boring Road, Sri Krishnapuri, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Anirudh Kumar Verma, Advocate |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Government Pleader 20 |
| | | Mr. Rajanikant Kumar, AC to GP-20 |
| For Resp. No. 9 | : | Mrs. Anukriti Jaipuriar, Advocate |

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 06-07-2026 Heard Mr. Anirudh Kumar Verma, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mrs. Anukriti Jaipuriar representing the Patna Metro Rail Corporation Ltd (for brevity, '**the Patna Metro**') and the State.

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

“in the nature of mandamus commanding



and directing upon the concerned respondents to formally issue and publish de-notification/ withdrawal notification in respect of the petitioner's land and direct correction of revenue records removing all references to acquisition proceedings by declaring that continuation of acquisition entry without acquisition is illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional upon inaction on the application filed in this respect and for other relief(s) for which the petitioners is found entitled to.

3. The petitioner claims to be the purchaser of a piece of land with following details:

“Khata No. 13

Plot No. 1200

Area 0.149 Acre

Mauza Khemnichak, Jaganpura, Patna”

4. It was purchased from Usha Rani wife of Shri Prakash Singh (not made party-respondent in the present case) in the year 2007 and subsequently, has come in a peaceful physical possession.

5. The contention is that for the Patna Metro Project, (Khemnichak Metro Station), 0.4153 land was proposed to be acquired under Mauza-Jaganapur, Thana no. 26, Phulwarisharif,



Patna. Accordingly, notice was issued on 01.08.2025.

6. The petitioner preferred an objection before the District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna which was taken up and vide an order dated 02.12.2025, recording that the concerned representative of '**the Patna Metro**' supported by the letter no. 6059 dated 01.12.2025 have denied acquisition of the petitioner's land observed that the 0.0415 Acre of land which is proposed for the acquisition do no include the land of Ford Hospital (petitioner herein).

7. Still aggrieved, the writ petition.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna on the report submitted by 'the Patna Metro' has recorded that his land is not part of the acquisition, it may hamper his future deal with regard to the land as it may be recorded as acquired land by 'the Patna Metro'.

9. Ms. Jaipuriyar for '**the Patna Metro**' submits that the land of Usha Rani actually is 9 Acres of which a minuscule 0.0415 part has been acquired and already taken in possession by it. So far as the land of the **Ford Hospital** (petitioner herein) is concerned, it was neither the part of the acquisition nor '**the Patna Metro**' intends to take the said land. She further submits that after recording the aforesaid statement made by the



representative of '**the Patna Metro**', the D.L.A.O., Patna has already decided the matter and unnecessary and without impleading Usha Rani as party-respondent, the present petition.

10. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an order has come from the D.L.A.O., Patna, as recorded above, and when '**the Patna Metro**' has already clarified today in Court which is now part of the present order, reserving his right to agitate the matter, is situation so arise, the writ petition be disposed of.

11. This Court has already taken note of the entire facts and have recorded the statements/submissions of '**the Patna Metro**' as also have taken note of the order of the District Land Acquisition Officer, Patna. Apprehension cannot be a basis for filing a writ petition and/or any ground for the interference by the Court.

12. Granting liberty to the petitioner to agitate the matter, if required, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| U | | | |
|---|--|--|--|

