

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2104 of 2014

Arvind Kumar Sharma, son of Late Surya Deo Rai, Proprietor of Laxmi Enterprises, District Board Campus, Station Road Muzaffarpur, P.S. Town Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Election Officer-cum-District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur
3. The Deputy Election Officer, Muzaffarpur
4. The Deputy Collector, Incharge, District Election Office, Muzaffarpur

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Radha Krishna Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Sanjay Kumar, AC to AAG 6

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 08-10-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Counsel for the State.

2. This writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to pay the outstanding dues to the petitioner claimed at Rs.21,89,215/- towards the bills raised by him in respect of the supply of stationery etc. pursuant to the orders issued by the respondents.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the supply of the requisite materials was duly made but only partial payment of Rs. 7,57,719/- has been made, leaving a substantial amount still outstanding to the petitioner.

4. In view of the nature of the grievance of the petitioner, this writ petition is disposed of with consent, granting liberty to the

petitioner to approach the District Election Officer-cum-District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur (respondent no.2) with a fresh representation, who will examine the matter and take steps for payment of the admitted dues of the petitioner within a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this judgment. If the admitted amount is not paid to the petitioner within such period then he would be entitled for simple interest at the rate of 10% per annum to be calculated from the date it became due till the date of its final payment. It is further clarified that if the entire claim of the petitioner is not found admitted then he should be communicated the reasons for reaching such conclusion.

5. It is made clear that this Court is not expressing any opinion on the merits of the claim of the petitioner.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

U			
---	--	--	--