

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19661 of 2013

Vijay Prasad son of Late Kamta Prasad, resident of village-Ghoghi Bariyarpur, P.O. Piri Bazar, P.s. PiriBazar, District Lakhisarai, Elected Chairman cum Managing Director (CMD) of M/s IDIO Construction and Industries (India)Ltd. Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Joint Secretary, Department of Mines and Minerals Govt. of India, Shashtri Bhawan New Delhi,
2. The Registrar of Company Ministry of Company Affairs Govt. of India 'A' Wing, 4th floor, Maurya Lok, Patna
3. The Secretary Department of Mines and Minerals, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate , Lakhisarai
5. The District Mineral Development Officer, Lakhisarai
6. Smt. Renu Singh, wife of Krishnanand Singh resident of Mohalla, Sri Krishna Nagar, Plot No. 176, Road No. 23, P.S. Budha Colony, Patna

.... Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the respondent no.2
For respondent nos. 3 to 5
For the State

Mr. Anshuman Singh, CGC No.1
Mr. Rajendra Prasad, SPL. P.P. Mines
Mr. Ashok Kumar Chaoudhary, AAG-13
Mrs. Reena Kumar with
Mr. Nishant Sinha

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 24-06-2016

No one appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Heard the counsel for the Mines Department, the State as well as respondent no.2.

The petitioner claims himself as the founder Director of M/s IDIO Construction and Industries (India)Ltd., Patna. The writ application prays for a direction commanding the Mines and Mineral Department of the Govt. of India for taking action against the private respondent no.6 for her deliberate and wilful act of omission and commission and working against the Company under the name and style of M/s IDIO Construction and Industries (India)Ltd.

Basically, it appears a dispute between the two companies is going

on.

A counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent nos. 3 to 5 is filed.

The counsel for the respondents has drawn attention of the court to paragraph 4 thereof wherefrom it appears that there is internal dispute between the petitioner and the private respondent which has already been raised before the Company Law Board. It is the submission of the respondents that any dispute of such nature can be gone into and decided by the forum under the Companies Act.

Seen thus, it appears that the petitioner has already approached the appropriate forum for resolution of the dispute. Nothing more is required to be done in the present writ petition. It is accordingly dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--