

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P (C) No. 8216 of 2022

M/s Sarala Engineering Works

.....

Petitioner

Mr. S.C. Dash, Advocate

Vs.

***The District Collector, Jajpur and
others***

.....

Opposite Parties

Mr.P.P. Mohanty, AGA

CORAM:

DR. JUSTICE B.R. SARANGI

MISS JUSTICE SAVITRI RATHO

ORDER

31.03.2022

Order No.

01.

This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.

2. Heard Mr. S.C. Dash, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. P.P. Mohanty, learned Additional Government Advocate.

3. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking direction to the opposite parties, more particularly opposite party no.1 to take a decision in the matter of releasing the admitted dues of the petitioner as per his representation dated 29.12.2021 under Annexure-5 in consultation with the opposite parties 2 to 4 for release of the pending bills of Rs.6,00,000/- in his favour within a stipulated period along with the interest accrued thereon.

4. Mr. S.C. Dash, learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has executed the Public Work as per the Agreement and Work Order issued by the opposite parties pertaining to the work, i.e. installation of street light at Ambedkar Mandap to Dusasan Jena House with a sanctioned estimated cost of Rs.4,00,000/-, installation of street light at Jhinkadiha for Rs.1,00,000/- and installation of street light at Dihaharijan Sahi for Rs.1,00,000/-, under Sahupada Gram Panchayat. After completion of the work, the completion certificates have also been issued by the competent authorities under Annexure-4 series and 6 series. However, in spite of such completion certificate, the Block

Development Officer, Bari is not releasing the bill in favour of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that highlighting the grievances, the petitioner has made a representation to opposite party No.1-District Collector, Jajpur, vide Annexure-5, but no action has yet been taken on his representation and the bill amount of Rs.6,00,000/- has not yet been released in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, he prayed that this writ petition may be disposed of directing opposite party no.1 to consider the representation of the petitioner under Annexure-5, within a stipulated time, to which learned counsel for the State has no objection.

5. As agreed to by learned counsel for the parties, this Court disposes of the writ petition directing opposite party No.1 to consider the representation filed by the petitioner vide Annexure-5, and pass appropriate order in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy this order.

6. Issue urgent certified copy as per rules.

(DR. B.R. SARANGI)
JUDGE

(SAVITRI RATHO)
JUDGE

Arun/ Pusp