

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 3562 of 2019**

Puran Kumar Mandavi S/o Ram Lal Mandavi Aged About 31 Years
R/o School Para, Belgaon, Tahsil Narayanpur, District Narayanpur
Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Road And Transport Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Chief Executive Officer, Mukhya Mantri Gram Sadak Yozna, Civil Line, Raipur, District - Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Nirman Bhawan, Sector - 19, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Collector, Narayanapur, District Narayanpur Chhattisgarh.
5. Engineer In Chief, Water Resources Department, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Narayanpur Chhattisgarh.
7. Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department, Narayanpur, District - Narayanpur Chhattisgarh.
8. Executive Engineer, Bridge Department, Jagdalpur, District Jagdalpur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. S.P. Sahu, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Abhyunnati Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****11/02/2020**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking release of the amount payable to the petitioner in respect of construction of road and bridge, which the petitioner has undertaken in district Narayanpur in the year 2017-18.
2. On perusal of the record it is found that the writ petition is not supported with any relevant document, by which it could be ascertained that the petitioner in fact was granted the award for the

construction of road and the bridge, neither is there any sort of an agreement or contract entered into between the petitioner and the respondents to determine the same.

3. In the absence of the same, this Court would find it difficult to issue any writ to the respondents. Moreover, if the case of the petitioner is that of having completed the work arising out of a contract or an agreement, it would be difficult for this Court to settle the same by issuance of any sort of writ in favour of the petitioner as there can be a claim which would have been disputed by the respondents or where there could be a dispute in respect of the work having been performed being satisfactory or not?
4. For all the aforesaid reasons, this Court is of the opinion that the remedy available to the petitioner would be by approaching the concerned Civil Court for the relief that the petitioner has sought for. The writ petition accordingly in the opinion of this Court is not sustainable and the same deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved