

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 764 of 2015**

Meinhardt Singapore Ptd. Ltd. (India Branch) Having its Corporate Office at A-8, Sector 16 Noida 201301, UP Represented through Rajesh Shrivastava, Aged 44 years, S/o Shri G.C. Shrivastava, Country Director.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Bilaspur Municipal Corporation, Through its Commissioner, Vikas Bhawan, Nehru Chowk, Bilaspur, Civil and Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh 495001
2. State Urban Development Authority Through its Chief Executive Officer, R.D.A. Building, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Department of Urban Administration and Development, Through its Secretary, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh 492001
4. Mayor in Council, Through Mayor, Bilaspur Municipal Corporation, Vikas Bhawan, Nehru Chowk, Bilaspur, Civil and Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh 495001.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Sanjay Chaddha and Shri Mukesh Sharma, Advocate.
For Respondent-Corporation	:	Shri J.A. Lohani, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri P. Sam Koshy, J.

Order on Board**Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice****05/05/2015**

1. We have heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the Respondents.
2. Under a contract agreement dated 21.7.2011, the Petitioner was appointed as Consultant with regard to certain services for planning and designing of storm water drainage system for Bilaspur city. The terms and conditions for payment were incorporated in the agreement. It is the case of the Petitioner that the rates quoted by it were approved. But against a bill of Rs. 4,42,74,042/- the Respondents have paid only Rs. 35,70,459/- and have

failed to pay the balance despite reminders.

3. We find from the letter dated 25.7.2014 of the Respondent-Municipal Corporation that the award of works to the Petitioner is not in dispute and the issue for payment of arrears is engaging the attention of the Corporation. The Petitioner has further written to the Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Administration on 5.12.2014 in respect of its claims for payment under the contract.

4. In our opinion, the writ petition raises a pure money claim and no directions can be issued by us for payment. It is for the Petitioner to pursue remedies appropriately. Suffice it to observe that we expect the Respondents to consider the grievance of the Petitioner and pay the legitimate dues in accordance with law.

5. The writ application stands disposed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P.Sam Koshy)
JUDGE