

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7597 of 2015

=====

Raju Yadav son of Late Kailash Prasad, resident of Mohalla- Baba Chawk , North Patel Nagar , P.S.- Shastri Nagar , District- Patna. At present of Hanuman Nagar, New Punaichak, Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The South Bihar Power Holding Distribution (Company) Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan-I, bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Chief Engineer Civil, Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan-I, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The Chief Manager-cum-Director, Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan-I, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited, Punaichak Division, Patna.
5. The Managing Director-cum-Chairman, Bihar State Power Holding Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan-I , Bailey Road, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Mani Bhushan Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondents : M/s. Vinay Kirti Singh, Vijay Kr. Verma & Akhileshwar Singh, Advocates.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-07-2015 I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondents.

On limited issue being raised at the time of hearing of this application, the same is being disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to take steps for reference of the matter to the competent forum/arbitrator for redressal of his grievance as it appears that there is a dispute with regard to total work done as well as quality of the work done between the petitioner and the respondents for which part payment has been withheld by the respondent Power Company.

So far the allegation of demand of bribe is concerned, it is contended by learned counsel for the respondents that when this Court was passing the order in the earlier round of litigation directing the Managing Director to consider the matter himself or for referring it to the Chief Engineer concerned for its consideration, the petitioner never raised any objection and now he is taking ground that the Chief Engineer was making some illegal demand even before filing of the earlier writ petition as has been submitted during the course of argument by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner has disclosed nothing as to on which date or what time or in presence of whom, such illegal demand was made by the Chief Engineer rather a bald statement has been made.

Be that as it may, since learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner will pursue the aforesaid matter before a competent forum, he is granted such liberty clarifying that this Court has not expressed its opinion on the merit of such issue.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

N.H./-

--	--	--	--