

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14422 of 2017

=====

Ram Uday Singh, Son of Late Ram Pratap Singh, resident of Village - Paspura,
P.O. Paspura, P.S. Muffasil, District- Begusarai.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna through its Managing Director.
2. The Managing Director, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.
3. The Chief of Claim, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.
4. The Senior Deputy Chief of Claim, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.
5. The District Manager, Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Ltd. Munger.
6. The Assistant Manager, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., CMR Godown, Tarapur, District- Munger.
7. The Assistant Manager-cum- Incharge Upliftment, TPDS Godown, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Munger.
8. The Deputy Chief of Computer, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.
9. The Deputy Chief of Transportation, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation, Khadya Bhawan, Daroga Rai Path, R. Block, Road No. 2, Patna.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjeet Kumar, Advocate

For Respondent-BSFC : Mr. Nirmal Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-04-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing
of the order contained in Memo No. 9356 dated 11.09.2017 issued
under the signature of the Managing Director, Bihar State Food & Civil
Supply Corporation Ltd. (for short, 'the Corporation') whereby and



whereunder the agreement to work as Transport cum Handling Agent (Main) in the revenue district of Madhubani, executed with the petitioner has been cancelled.

3. At the very outset, this Court takes note that the second supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioner in which it is stated that remedy before the Bihar Public Works Contracts Disputes Arbitration Tribunal could not be availed of as the said Tribunal was not functioning at the time of filing of the writ petition which is however now functioning.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard.

5. In the above view of the matter, 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.

6. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Ibrar

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	23.04.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

