

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8305 of 2015

Manish Kumar, son of Sri Hari Kishun Singh, Proprietor of M/s Maa Vindhyavasini Pipe Industries, S-14, Industrial Area, Fatwah, Patna resident of East Indira Nagar, Road No. 5, P.S.- Kankarbagh, District- Patna

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. Principal Secretary, Department of Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. Finance Secretary, Department of Finance, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. Director, Industries-cum-Chairman, High Level State Level Committee, Constituted under M.S.M.E., Government of Bihar, Patna
5. South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited through its Managing Director (South), Vidyut Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna
6. Chairman, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna
7. Secretary, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhavan Bailey Road, Patna
8. General Manager-cum-Chief Engineer, Patna Eastern Zone, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna
9. Superintendent Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhavan, Bailey Road, Patna
10. Executive Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Fatuha Division, Fatuha, Patna

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bimal Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ajay Behari Sinha, SC-19
	:	Mr. Suryakant Kumar, AC to SC-19
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate
	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 02-06-2015

Learned counsel for the petitioner has raised a grievance that he has not being given the incentives as promised under the Bihar Industrial Incentive Policy, 2011.

2. It goes without saying that if the Bill stands covered under the said policy, he would be entitled to the incentives

contained therein.

3. Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel appearing for Power Distribution Company Limited, submits that the petitioner has not been able to show that he has not been given the required exemption.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is willing to pay the entire amount and he only requires the breakup to ensure whether incentives have actually been given.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, if the petitioner approaches the Executive Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited (respondent no.10), he would furnish the breakup within three weeks. Thereafter, if the petitioner pays the required dues, his electric line would be restored.

6. This application stands disposed of.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--