

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9415 of 2011

- =====
1. Uday Kumar son of Late Shivdani Singh resident of village Kusumhar P.S. Akbarpur, Nawada.
 2. Pramod Kumar, son of Sukhdeo Prasad Singh, resident of village Lohanipur Nonia P.S. Akbarpur in the district of Nawada
 3. Arvind Kumar son of Sarju Singh, resident of village Shyama Pachrukhi P.S. Akbarpur, Nawada
 4. Arun Kumar, son of Late Sidheshwari Prasad Singh, resident of village Patori, P.S. Akbarpur in the district of Nawada.
 5. Parmeshwar Prasad, son of Late Barho Prasad, resident of village Sukhamarahan P.S. Meskaur in the district of Nawada
 6. Madan Sao, son of late Amu Sao resident of village Panti P.S. Akbarpur, Nawada
 7. Rambalak Sinha, son of Late Baldeo Singh resident of village Amma P.S. Akbarpur, Nawada

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Director, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate cum Collector Nawada
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nawada
5. The District Co-operative Officer, Nawada
6. The Block Development Officer, Akbarpur Nawada
7. The Block Cooperative Extension Officer, Akbarpur, Nawada

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Devendra Kr Sinha Aag2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 07-09-2015 Mr. Sunil Kumar No.2 for the petitioner and A.C. AAG

2 for the State are present.

Mr. Kumar fairly states that in spite of his best efforts he could not obtain instruction in the matter.

The writ application has been filed for quashing the notice issued by the Block Development Officer calling upon the

petitioners to refund/re-deposit certain amount which was sanctioned to the petitioner(s) for the financial year 1994-95 for supplying bricks failing which the authority was to lodge an FIR. This Court is not ware as to whether the FIR was lodged or not.

Considering the averments made in the writ petition and the relief prayed for therein, in my view, no case for interference with the matter is made out.

The application is dismissed.

Dismissal of the writ application shall, however, not preclude the petitioners in seeking other remedy available in law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--