

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4216 of 2015

=====

Shambhu Rai, Son of Sri Kapildeo, Resident of Village-Chiutana, P.S.-
Baikunthpur, District- Gopalganj.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Gopalganj.
3. The District Development Commissioner, Gopalganj.
4. The Chairman, District Board, Gopalganj.
5. The District Engineer, District Board, Gopalganj

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-11-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to allot the shop no. 11 or any other shop to the petitioner as the petitioner has applied for allotment before Gopalganj District Board and deposited Rs. 32,000/- as advance amount as per direction of the respondent.

2. As none appeared on behalf of the petitioner, the matter was passed over for a few cases. However on repeat call, the petitioner was again not represented.

3. From the averments made in the writ petition, it transpires that the petitioner submitted application on 16.02.2008 for allotment of shop no. 11 pursuant to offer made by the Gopalganj



District Board for allotment of shops @ 66,000/- each. It is stated that the petitioner deposited an amount of Rs. 32,000/- and is ready to deposit the remaining Rs. 34,000/- for allotment of shop.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the petitioner did not deposit the requisite amount of Rs. 66,000/- for allotment of shop nor participated in the bidding process. On being noticed, the petitioner did not also respond for getting the refund of the amount of Rs. 32,000/- deposited by him.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respondent and on consideration of the materials on record, this Court finds the writ petition to be devoid of merit. Admittedly, the petitioner did not comply with the requirement of depositing Rs. 66,000/- for the shop nor did he participate in the bidding process. Moreover, the petitioner has approached this Court in the year 2015 after a lapse of about seven years and has not acted with due diligence in pursuing his remedies.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	17.11.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

