GAHC010199782022

2026:GAU-AS:16012

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/6442/2022

BHADRESWAR ROY
S/O- LATE DAYA CHAND ROY, VILL.- SINGIMARI, P.O. NAYAGAON, P.S. ABHAYAPURI, DIST. BONGAIGAON, ASSAM, PIN- 783384.

VERSUS

THE STATE OF ASSAM AND 5 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER AND SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF ASSAM, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND D.M. (LR), DISPUR, GUWAHATI-6.

2:NATIONAL HIGHWAY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
REPRESENTED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF MINISTRY OF ROADS TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY
GOVT. OF INDIA
NEW DELHI-110001.

3:DY. GENERAL MANAGER (P)
NATIONAL HIGHWAY AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED
PMU
DHUBRI
P.O. AND DIST. DHUBRI
ASSAM
PIN- 783301.

4:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
BONGAIGAON
P.O. AND DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM
PIN- 783381.

5:THE ADDL. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER (REVENUE)
BONGAIGAON
P.O. AND DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM
PIN- 783381.

6:THE CIRCLE OFFICER

SRIJANGRAM REVENUE CIRCLE
P.O. ABHAYAPURI
DIST. BONGAIGAON
ASSAM
PIN- 783384

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. K C ROY,

Advocate for the Respondent : GA, ASSAM, SC, NHIDC,SC, REVENUE

BEFORE
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN DEV CHOUDHURY

ORDER

02.11.2026

1. None appears for the petitioner on call. However, Mr. A. Bhattacharyya, learned Government Advocate, Assam representing the respondent No. 1 and Mr. R. K. Talukdar, learned Standing Counsel for the NHIDCL representing the respondent Nos. 2 and 3, are present.

2. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that the authorities are seeking to take over possession of his land for the widening/improvement of Highway near the Tulungia Jogighopa Bridge Approach Section of the Bilasipara-Guwahati road, without carrying out a proper survey of the land.

3. The respondent NHIDCL has filed an affidavit, and it is their stand

that due verification was carried out, and a joint survey report was submitted and as per joint survey report, the Dag Nos. 102 and 27, belonging to the petitioner has not been notified. The Dag No. 102 could not be found in the LAP and Dag No. 27 falls beyond the proposed Right of Way as per the LAP. Accordingly, it is contended by them that no land from the Dag Nos. 102 and 27 has been acquired for the purpose of the aforesaid project.

4. Such stand has not been denied by the petitioner by filing any reply affidavit.

5. Be that as it may, as none appears for the petitioner on call, the writ petition stands dismissed for non prosecution.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant