

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1993 of 2023

=====

Maheshwar Jha X M/S Mahesh Automobile Works, New Industrial Area,
Bela, Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 4th Floor Udyog Bhawan, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004 through its Managing Director.
2. The Managing Director, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, 4th Floor Udyog Bhawan, East Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800004
3. The Executive Director, Regional Office, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Darbhanga.
4. The Development Officer, Regional Office, Bihar Industrial Area Development Authority, Darbhanga.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amaresh Kumar Sinha, Adv., Mr. Vaibhav Narayan, Adv., Mr. Manik Vedsen, Adv.
For the B.I.A.D.A	:	Mr. Yashraj Bardhan, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL ORDER

- 2 06-04-2023 1. The petitioner has preferred this writ petition with a prayer to allot him piece of 600 square feet of vacant land, which is said to be adjacent too and behind the back of the land of the petitioner's unit in the New Industrial Area Development Authority, Bela, Darbhanga.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied for allotment of the said land, as he requires more land than what was initially allotted to him and handed over to him on 31.03.2007.



3. Learned counsel further submits that his application was initially entertained and he has also deposited the requisite fees for the said purpose. However, in spite of the said application having been filed, the plot was not allotted to the petitioner and the same was refused by the respondent B.I.A.D.A. vide its letter dated 09.10.2017. B.I.A.D.A. has refused to allot the land on the ground that the land was reserved for P.H.E.D. which could not be allotted to him.

4. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has come to know that the said plot of land measuring 600 square feet has been allotted recently to someone else ignoring petitioner's claim. Learned counsel submits that he had made a representation in this regard to the respondent authority, but the respondents have not submitted any response and, therefore, he has filed this writ petition before this Court.

5. I have considered the submissions, this Court finds that the petitioner was allotted 1000 square feet area of land initially. There is no promise on part of the respondents that they would allot the adjacent 600 square feet of land to the petitioner. Thus, there is no right created in favour of the petitioner for allotment of the adjacent land.

6. It is also noticed that the prayer made by the



petitioner was refused in the year 2017, against which the petitioner did not take up any remedy, nor he raised any grievances at that time. It appears that on the basis of surmises and conjecture he has filed this writ petition as he does not mention, as to whom the land has now been allotted. Bald and vague allegations made in the writ petition cannot be examined.

7. The writ petition is devoid of merits and accordingly dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Pravinkumar/-

Item No. 9

U			
---	--	--	--

