

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17806 of 2010

=====

M/S Kaimur Construction, a Partnership Firm having its Office At 3/96 Gaurakshani, Sasaram, Distt.- Rohtas (Bihar), Through One Of It'S Partner Sri Mithilesh Kumar S/O Late Sudarshan Singh, R/O Mohalla-Gaurakshani, P.S.- Sasaram, Distt.- Rohtas At Sasaram (Bihar)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Secretary Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary, Rural Works Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Chief Engineer, Rural Works Department, Bihar, Patna
4. The Superintending Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division-2, Sasaram
5. The Executive Engineer, Rural Works Department, Works Division-2, Sasaram

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Kishore Pd.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Devendra Kumar Sinha, AAG-2

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 15-04-2015 After having heard the parties and in view of the nature of grievances/claims raised on behalf of the petitioner, fully detailed in paragraph-1 of the writ petition, the petitioner is hereby directed to file a comprehensive representation before the respondent no. 2 – the Secretary, Rural Works Department, Patna with all supporting documents raising all the pleas, which have been raised in the present writ petition

If such a comprehensive representation is filed on behalf of the petitioner within a period of one month from today with a certified copy of the present order, then the respondent no.2 shall be obliged to consider and decide the claims raised on behalf of the petitioner by a reasoned and speaking order at an early date preferably within a maximum period of two months from the date of filing of such representation.

If on consideration of the materials the respondent no.2

comes to a conclusion that claims raised on behalf of the petitioner are admissible , then consequential order shall also be issued for grant of such admissible claims without any unnecessary further delay.

It is clarified that this Court has not gone into the merits of the claims raised on behalf of the petitioner in the present writ petition and it is left to be decided by the respondent no.2 strictly in accordance with law.

The writ petition stands finally disposed of with the observations and directions made above.

(Birendra Prasad Verma, J)

BTiwary/-

U			
---	--	--	--