

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12734 of 2013

=====

Pravin Chandra Prasad, Advocate Son Of Late Harish Chandra Prasad, Resident Of
Flat No. 208, Unnati Griham Apartment, Near Hi-Q Restaurant, Kachchi Talab
Road, New Yarpur, Patna-1 (Bihar), In Person

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India, Through Secretary, Chemical and Fertilizer
Department/Ministry Bharat Sarkar, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi
2. Chairman Cum Managing Director, Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Limited,
Registered Corporate Office, P.D.I.L. House, 12-A, Sector-24, Noida, District-
Gautam Budha Nagar (U.P.), Pin- 201302
3. In-Charge, Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Limited, Barauni Unit, P.O.-
Barauni Urvarak Nagar, District- Begusarai (Bihar), Pin- 851115

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Chandra Prasad (In person)
For the HFCL Mr. K.N.Gupta

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR MANDAL
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 20-06-2016

Heard the petitioner in person as well as Mr. Gupta appearing for
the Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation Ltd. (for short 'the Corporation').

Several years ago the petitioner had appeared on behalf of the
Corporation (respondent no.2). For non-payment of the professional bill/dues,
the writ petition has been filed. This is the second writ petition filed for the said
relief.

CWJC No. 4549 of 2012 was filed by the petitioner which was
disposed of on 01.03.2013 permitting him to represent the matter before the
respondents ventilating his grievance. Unquestionably, on a claim made by the
petitioner, the respondents have passed the bill at certain rate and made payment
thereof to the petitioner as is apparent from Annexure-A. The petitioner is
dissatisfied with the quantum of the payment of the dues. The present writ

petition is filed to question the logic and factual distortion made in the disposal of the representation by the respondent (Annexure-8).

It is difficult for this Court to grant further indulgence for recovery of the amount under a contract as is reflected from the writ petition. The high prerogative jurisdiction, in the facts of the case, should not be exercised. The petitioner may ventilate his grievance before the appropriate forum/authority in accordance with law.

The writ application is dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--