

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7627 of 2015

=====

M/s Maa Ambey Traders, Kachhi Sarai Road, Muzaffarpur, Proprietor Narendra Kumar Sharma, son of Late Suryadeo Rai, District Road Campus, Station Road, P.S.-Muzaffarpur Town, District-Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Muzaffarpur.
3. The Deputy Development Commissioner- cum - Additional Programme Co-ordinator (MANREGA), Muzaffarpur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ganjendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Raj Nandan Prasad, SC 9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-09-2015

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.15,30,000/- and Rs.2,67,750/- along with interest thereon against the bills submitted by it on account of supply of 3,00,000/- and 50,000/- printed job cards respectively.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the supply of the printed job cards was duly made by the petitioner but no payment has yet been made by the respondents.

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 Magistrate-cum-Collector, 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 six 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 it 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 it 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			
---	--	--	--