

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12198 of 2015

=====

Bijendra Kumar Singh, son of Ram Chalitra Singh, resident of Moh. Bihar Adarsh Colony, Bailey Road, Rukanpura, Post Office Bihar Veterinary College, Police Station, Rupaspur, District Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Vishwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna 800 001.
2. The Principal Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Vishwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna 800 001.
3. The Engineer-in-Chief-cum-Additional Secretary, Road Construction Department, Government of Bihar, Vishwaraiya Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna 800 001.
4. The Executive Engineer, Local Area Engineering Works, Division No. 2, Danapur, District Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Patna.
6. The Circle Officer, Bihta, District Patna.
7. The Circle Officer, Danapur, District Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Verma, Adv
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Apurva Kumar, AC to GA V

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 18-12-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents particularly respondent no. 4 to 6 for discharging their obligatory duty in making available the piece of land to the petitioner for construction of the Panchayat Sarkar Bhawan in Makhdumpur village of Bihta Block, District Patna as also at village Sarari and Danapur Block of District Patna as the agreement entered into between the petitioner and respondent no. 4 mandated for



but not acted upon by the concerned respondents causing difficulty in the commencement of the work leading to huge financial loss to the petitioner and blockage of security money deposited by the petitioner for the said purpose.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents at the very outset submits that the petitioner has not availed the alternative remedy before the Bihar Public Works Contracts Disputes Arbitration Tribunal and has directly approached this Court for redressal of his grievances.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner appears and has been heard. It is not disputed that remedy by way of arbitration before the Tribunal is available to the petitioner and admitted by the petitioner.

4. In view of the submission of learned counsel for the respondents, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The petitioner would be at liberty to avail of the remedy before the Bihar Public Works Contracts Disputes Arbitration Tribunal for redressal of his grievances, in accordance with law.

5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	21.12.2018
Transmission Date	NA

