

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18975 of 2010

=====

Baleshwar Prasad Singh S/O Late Ramotar Rai, R/O Vill.-Daudhaul, P.S.-
Maner, Distt.-Patna. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Collector, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 'Udyog Bhawan', First Floor, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
3. The Executive Engineer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 'Udyog Bhawan', First Floor, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
4. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 'Udyog Bhawan', First Floor, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
5. The Junior Engineer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Fatwa in the District of Patna.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Fatwa in the District of Patna.
7. The Assistant Engineer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 'Udyog Bhawan', First Floor, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
8. Technical Supervisor, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 'Udyog Bhawan', First Floor, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Upendra Prasad
Mrs. Veena Kumari Jaiswal
For the Respondent No.1 : Mr. Rajesh Singh, GP-16
For the Respondent No.2 to 8:Mr.Lalit Kishore, Sr. Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA PRASAD VERMA
ORAL ORDER

7 24-04-2015

When the matter has been taken up for consideration, a supplementary affidavit is being filed on behalf of the petitioner stating therein that in view of the office order dated 27.01.2015 (Annexure-10) issued under the signature of the respondent Executive Engineer, BIADA, Patna, part of the grievances of the petitioner have been redressed. However, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the other grievances so claimed and raised on behalf of the petitioner as indicated in paragraph-1 of the writ petition, have not been redressed till date though this matter is pending before this Court since 29.11.2010.

After having heard the parties for sometime and in view of the nature of grievances/claims raised on behalf of the petitioner, fully detailed in paragraph no.1 of the writ petition,

this Court is of the opinion that instead of keeping the matter pending for adjudicating on all the issues raised on behalf of the petitioner in the present writ petition, interest of justice shall be sub-served if the petitioner is granted liberty to file a comprehensive representation before the respondent no. 4 raising all the pleas with respect to surviving cause of action, which have raised in the present writ petition. It is ordered, accordingly.

If such a comprehensive representation is filed on behalf of the petitioner within a period of four weeks from today with a certified copy of the present order, then the respondent no.4 either herself/ himself or any other competent authority 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 period of three months from the date of filing of the representation by the petitioner.

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

It is clarified that this Court has not gone into the merits of the claims raised on behalf of the petitioner and it is left to be decided by the competent authority 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			
---	--	--	--