

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.859 of 2017

IN

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1838 of 2017

=====

M/s Shambhu Jha through its Proprietor Shambhu Jha, S/o Late Mahendra Jha,
Resident of Village and P.O. Ghoghardiha, P.S. Ghoghardiha, District- Madhubani.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The Union of India, through the Chairman, Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) Planning Commission, Govt. of India, 3rd Floor, Tower- II, Jeevan Bharti Building, Cannaught Circus, New Delhi (Head Office) PIN- 110001.
2. Shree Munna Razak, Manager, Capital Business System Ltd. (CBSL), 2nd Floor, Shalimar Cold Storage, Gate No. 1, Bye- Pass Road, Patna PIN- 800002.
3. The Project Manager (Sri Shiv Kumar Yadav), Project Manager, Megha Vimcom Pvt. Ltd. Branch Office, S-2/19, Tagore Town, Ardali Bazar, near Bank of India, Varanasi (U.P.) PIN- 221002.
4. The Regional Director, Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI) Regional Office, 1st Floor, Riada Central Office Building, Namkum Industrial Area, near STPI Lodhi, Ranchi- 834010.
5. M/S Megha Vimcom Pvt. Ltd. (MVCPL) through its Managing Director, 333, Lodha Complex, Near Shastri Circle Idapur- 313001 (Rajasthan) having its registered Office at IT- 1, EPIP, Sitapur, Jaipur- 302022 (Rajasthan).

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Kameshwar Prasad Gupta, Adv
Mr. Anwar Karim, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.D Sanjay, Addl. S.G.
Mrs. Kanak Verma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 03-08-2017

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, as the
agreement for the work done by the appellant and for which payment
has to be made is on the basis of an agreement entered into between
the appellant and the respondent No. 5, M/S Megha Vimcom Pvt.



Ltd., a private firm and the Central Government is not a party to such agreement, learned Writ Court has not committed any error in dismissing the Writ Petition as the dispute is between the appellant and a Private Limited Company. We find no error warranting reconsideration. However, the appellant may recourse to such remedy as may be available under law for recovery of the dues from respondent No. 5.

With the aforesaid, the appeal stands disposed of.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

Shageer/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	08/08/2017
Transmission Date	NA

