

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4342 of 2012

=====

Md.Wasimuddin Son Of Late Salimuddin Resident Of Village / Mohalla -
Mullahaleem Khan, P.O. - Lalbagh, P.S.- Laheria Sarai, District Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Industrial Development Commissioner, Industry Department, Bihar at New Secretariat, Patna
2. The Director, Industries Department, Govt. Of Bihar, Patna
3. The Chairman, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority At Udyog Bhawan East Of Gandhi Maidan, Patna
4. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority At Udyog Bhawan East Of Gandhi Maidan Patna
5. The Secretary, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority At Udyog Bhawan East Of Gandhi Maidan Patna
6. Consultant Media-Cum-OSD, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority At Udyog Bhawan East Of Gandhi Maidan Patna
7. Chief Administrative Officer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority At Udyog Bhawan East Of Gandhi Maidan Patna
8. The Executive Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Regional Office Barari, Bhagalpur
9. Development Officer, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Regional Office Barari, Bhagalpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Mahesh Prasad Singh
For the State	:	Mr.Kumar Sarav
For BIADA		Mr. Lalit Kishore
		Mr. Prashant Pratap

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 26-02-2020 Heard counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the respondents.

Writ petition has been filed alleging that since June, 2010 salary was not paid to the petitioner.

In the counter affidavit filed by the respondent-



BIADA, specific averment has been made in para 4 that dues salary of the petitioner has been paid and in support thereof, they have annexed Annexure E series to the counter affidavit giving detail.

Regarding some part, it has been stated that same has been deducted on the basis of his non-attendance/absence in light of rules and regulations.

Averment made in the counter affidavit has not been denied or disputed, though copy of the same has been served to the petitioner on 21.11.2019 receipt showing service of counter affidavit is also on record.

The writ petition is therefore, dismissed.

Petitioner, however would be at liberty to assail the order based on which he has been denied his salary or claim by showing to the authorities that due to justified reason he was absent for which rule permits to avail any kind of leave.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

s.hassan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

