

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16838 of 2013

=====

Mukesh Kumar, Son of Mohan Lal Prasad, Resident of Village - Hajiapur, P.O. +
P.S. and District - Gopalganj

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Executive Engineer, Building Construction Division, Gopalganj
3. The Assistant Engineer, Building Construction Sub - Division, Gopalganj
4. The Junior Engineer, Building Construction Sub - Division Gopalganj

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Yogendra Prasad Sinha, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Sanjay Mandal, AC to SC 6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-04-2018

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

2. This matter has been taken up out of turn on the
request of learned counsel for the petitioner for payment of his
outstanding dues and the petitioner sought for the following reliefs –

*“(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ/order and
direction to the Respondents to make payment of Rs.
1,31,900/- in favour of the petitioner in light of
agreement no. 3A-F2/2009-10 the petitioner had
completed repairing of Rostrum Barricading works and
other miscellaneous works for CM. Programme of Minz
Stadium, Gopalganj on 20.6.2009.*

*(ii) To issue further an appropriate writ/order
direction in nature of mandamus to the respondents to
make payment of Rs. 1,31,900/- with interest in favour
of the petitioner.*

(iii) To grant any other relief/reliefs for which the



petitioner is entitled."

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite completing the entire work in terms of the agreement dated 20.06.2009, an amount of Rs. 1,31,900/- remains outstanding for payment.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents invites attention to the order dated 12.02.2014 (Annexure-A to the counter affidavit), according to which the prayer of the petitioner has already been rejected.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on careful consideration of the materials available on record, this Court finds the writ petition to be devoid of merit. Neither any rejoinder to the counter affidavit has been filed nor has the petitioner sought for quashing of the order dated 12.02.2014 (Annexure-A) rejecting his claim.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	07.04.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

