

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17411 of 2014

=====

C and C Construction Ltd S/o Late Sharda Prasad Singh Permanent Resident
of Village and P.O. Bangarhatta, P.S. Singhia, District Samastipur Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Kaimur Bhabua.
3. The Assistant Mining Officer, Kaimur Mohania.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amit Shrivastava, Sr. Advocate Mr. Girish Pandey, Advocate Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

4 19-09-2024 The present writ petition has been filed
seeking the following reliefs:-

“1. That this is an application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari or such other writ /order/direction as is deemed fit and proper for quashing the order dated 08.08.2014 issued by the respondent no. 3 whereby and whereunder a demand of Rs. 21,51,330/- has been raised against the petitioner towards third and fourth installment with interest for alleged dues with regard to a License dated 04.02.2011 for storage of stones and installation of a



stone crusher for plot no. 560 and 668 situated at Mauza-Pusauli, P.S. Kudra, District- Kaimur.

A. That this application is being further filed for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus or such other writ / order/ direction commanding and directing the Respondents for refund of the two installments of Rs. 8,50,000/- (paid on 04.02.2011) and Rs. 8,99,184/- (paid on 28.03.2012) along with statutory interest from the said dates, for the reason that the petitioner was not able to execute the said License dated 04.02.2011 for the purposes of stone crushing in the area in question due to ban on the mining of stones in the area in question in view of notification no. 230/M dated 04.02.2010 being incorporated in Rule 53 of the Bihar Minor Concession Rules, 1972."

2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to avail such other alternative remedies as are otherwise available under the law, for redressal of the aforesaid grievances. Liberty, so sought, is granted.



3. The writ petition stands disposed off.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--

