

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19273 of 2011

=====

Narendra Kumar Vishwakarma Son of Late Sheo Nandan Vishwakarma Resident of
Bari Keshopur (Near Rly. No.2 School Maidan), P.O. Jamalpur, P.S. Jamalpur,
District - Munger (Bihar)

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Industries Department, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director Industries, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. District Magistrate, Munger
5. The Managing Director, Bihar State Financial Corporation, Fraser Road, Patna
6. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Udyog Bhawan, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna
7. The General Manager, District Industry Centre, Munger
8. The Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India, Zonal Office, Khanzarpur, Bhagalpur
9. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Rly. Colony, Jamalpur, Munger
10. The Branch Manager, Bihar State Financial Corporation, Katahal Bari Khanzarpur, Bhagalpur
11. The Director, Small Industry Service Institute Industrial Estate, Patna
12. The Executive Director Regional Office, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Large Industrial Estate, Bhagalpur

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha No.3, Advocate
For the BSFC	:	Mr. Raj Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the BIADA	:	Mr. Prashant Pratap, Advocate Mr. Dev Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Kumar Manglam, AC to GP15

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 01-04-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to
the respondents to rehabilitate/revive with all facilities to the unit by

advancing loan or in the alternative to pay compensation to the petitioner for the loss caused on account of not providing sufficient loan in time as a result of which the unit became sick on 14.10.1987.

3. At the very outset learned counsel for the respondent BIADA submits that no relief ought to be granted to the petitioner in the present case, considering that the petitioner's unit became sick as far back as in the year 1987. Thereafter, repeated show cause notices were issued to the petitioner for commencing production, but on account of failure in that regard, the petitioner's unit was cancelled and deregistered by order dated 14.08.2007. Such order having not been taken up in appeal by the petitioner, the same was later on confirmed by letter dated 24.07.2008. The petitioner has also not brought on record any material to show that he took any action thereafter even under the Exit Policy of 2011 which requires a representation to be made before the BIADA. The petitioner has also not filed any rejoinder to the counter affidavit.

4. Having heard the parties, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter as the petitioner appears to be pursuing a stale claim. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran

U			
---	--	--	--