

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8996 of 2016

=====

Rajeev Ranjan Singh Son of Sri Krishnadeo Singh Proprietor of M/s Satya Sai Construction Resident of Mohalla- Ward no. 1 PS Katihar, District Katihar.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Managing Director Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Nigam Ltd, Bihar Patna
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer, North Bihar Circle, Bihar Rajya Pul Nirman Ltd, Bihar Patna
3. The Senior Project Engineer, Bihar Rajyapul Nirman Ltd Work Division Katihar.
4. The Project Engineer work Sub-Divisional Purnea.
5. The Junior Engineer, Bihar Rajya Pul Nigam Ltd, Work Sub-Division, Purnea.
6. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary Govt. of Bihar, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Manish Kumar, G.P.-8

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 12-07-2016 Heard the parties.

The prayer made by the petitioner in this writ petition is for an appropriate direction to the authorities of the Bihar State Bridge Construction Corporation Limited more particularly the respondent no. 3 the Senior Project Engineer for payment of his admissible dues.

Mr. Amit Kashyap appearing for the petitioner in reference to a representation of the petitioner addressed to the respondent no. 3 dated 18.3.2010 present at Annexure-10 submits

that the request of the petitioner has been responded to by the Project Engineer which though mentions forfeiture of security and earnest deposit but the petitioner has no knowledge about the same.

Be that as it may, considering the nature of the relief prayed by the petitioner, I deem it fit and proper to dispose of the writ petition with the direction to the respondent no. 3, the Senior Project Engineer, to consider the grievance of the petitioner and dispose of the same within a maximum period of three months from the date of receipt / production of a copy of this order.

It goes without saying that whatsoever amount that is found admissible for payment to the petitioner should be made to him within the same period and in case any part thereof is found inadmissible, it should be disposed of by a speaking order but should be passed after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--