

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15485 of 2011

- =====
1. Babal Stone Works Through Its Proprietor Ram Pravesh Singh S/O Late Ram Prasad Singh R/O Vill. Dhuan, P.S. Sasaram, District - Rohtas (Sasaram)
 2. Dheeraj Stone Works, Through Its Proprietor, Lalan Singh S/O Ram Naresh Singh R/O Mohalla - Fazalganj, P.S. Sasaram (Model), District - Rohtas (Sasaram)
 3. Gupteshwar Stone Works, Through Its Proprietor Om Prakash Singh S/O Late Muni Singh R/O Vill. Khilanganj, P.S. Sasaram, District - Rohtas
 4. Jai Bhawani Stone Chips, Through Its Proprietor Sumant Kumar Singh R/O Mohalla Mehta Colony Near Mico, G.T. Road, P.S. Sasaram, District - Rohtas (Sasaram)

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Mines & Geology, Bihar, Patna
3. The District Magistrate, Rohtas
4. The Assistant Director, Mines & Geology, Rohtas
5. The Bihar State Pollution Control Board, through its Secretary, Bihar, Patna
6. The Secretary, Bihar State Pollution Control Board, Bihar, Patna

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rajendra Prasad
Mr. Shivendra Kishore

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2. 05-08-2015 Heard Sri Sanjeev Kumar, learned counsel for petitioners, Sri Rajendra Prasad, learned counsel, who has appeared on behalf of respondent/Mines and Geology Deptt. as well as Sri Shivendra Kishore, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent/Bihar State Pollution Control Board.

In the present petition, four petitioners, invoking writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of

India, have prayed for directing the respondent authority for not disturbing them from operating their crusher machines as they are valid licensee of stockist licence for stone mineral used for crusher.

In the prayer portion itself, provision of law has been incorporated, but in the writ petition, nothing has been brought to show that any of the right of the petitioners has been infringed. Only oral submission has been made by learned counsel for petitioners that petitioners had obtained licence on the assurance that raw-materials will be made available by the department concerned. In the writ petition, no such document has been brought on record to suggest that before grant of licence, any assurance was given by the department for providing such things. In absence of any such pleading, only on vague submission, no writ can be issued.

The writ petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

U			
---	--	--	--