

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16169 of 2023

=====

Ram Kishore Agrawal Son of Jagat Narayan Agrawal, Prop. M/s R.K. Electrical and Decorators, resident of village Chatti Road, P.S. Muffasil, District Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Principal Secretary, Revenue and Land Reform Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Begusarai.
4. The Deputy Collector, Land Reforms, Begusarai.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Begusarai.
6. The Circle Officer, Barauni, District Begusarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raj Dulhar Sah, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Raj Kishore Roy (Gp 18)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-07-2026

1. The petitioner has filed the Writ petition for the following reliefs:

“for issuance of a Writ of mandamus and any other appropriate Writ/Writs, order/orders, direction or directions to the concerned respondent's authorities to pay the admitted outstanding dues of Rs. 1511652/- with interest at the rate of 12% Per Annum on account of the performance of certain works as per



work order vide Memo No. 1616/dt. 1.10.2014 and vide order memo No. 1666 dated 17.10.2015 issued by of the District Magistrate, Begusarai in Simariya Mass Mela 2014 to 2017 i.e. for providing light, sound chair, Generator, Videography, stick photography and other trifle works in the Simariya Mass Mela during 2014 to 2017 for the convenience of people."

2. The brief facts culled out of the petition are that the petitioner was awarded the work of providing accommodation and other facilities during the Simariya Mass Mela, pursuant to Work Order Memo No.1616 dated 01.10.2014 and Memo No.1666 dated 17.10.2015 issued by the District Magistrate, Begusarai. According to the petitioner, he executed the allotted work to the satisfaction of the District Administration. It is the case of the petitioner that on account of an unexpected increase in the number of visitors during the Mela, he also carried out additional work at the request of the authorities.



3. The petitioner claims that after completion of the work, he submitted bills amounting to Rs.31,67,082/- for the works executed during the years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2019. Despite of repeated requests, the respondent authorities did not release the entire amount.

4. The petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing C.W.J.C. No.13556 of 2021 seeking for payment of the outstanding bills. The said Writ petition was disposed of by order dated 09.03.2022. Pursuant thereto, the respondents released only part payment, leaving the balance amount unpaid. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted several representations and also served a legal notice upon the authorities, but no further payment was made. Aggrieved thereby, the present Writ petition has been filed.

5. The Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner duly executed the work entrusted to him by the District Administration, including the additional work undertaken at the



request of the authorities. It is submitted that despite completion of the work and submission of the bills, the respondents have failed to release the entire amount due to the petitioner.

6. According to the Learned counsel, non-availability of funds cannot be a valid ground to deny payment for work already executed, and the action of the respondents is arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 300A of the Constitution of India.

7. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the respondents.

8. The Learned counsel for the respondents submits that in compliance with the earlier order passed by this Court, the claim of the petitioner was duly examined and the admissible amount was released. It is submitted that a sum of Rs.47,705/- relating to Simariya Mass Mela, 2014 and Rs.9,07,000/- relating to Simariya Mass Mela, 2015, totaling Rs.9,54,705/-, was found payable and after statutory deductions, a sum of Rs.9,18,425/- was paid to the petitioner through



Cheque No.000071 dated 02.04.2022.

9. The Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that the remaining amount claimed by the petitioner is not admissible as there was no work order issued by the competent authority in support of the alleged additional work. It is also submitted that the vouchers relied upon by the petitioner were neither approved nor verified by the competent authority. According to the respondents, payment has already been made strictly on the basis of approved work orders and verified vouchers and, therefore, no further amount is payable.

10. A rejoinder affidavit has also been filed on behalf of the petitioner.

11. Referring to the rejoinder affidavit, the Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's claim cannot be rejected merely on the ground that the vouchers were not approved or verified. It is submitted that the bills were prepared on the basis of the work orders and certificates issued by the Circle Officer, Barauni certifying



execution of the work. It is further submitted that the relevant work orders have already been brought on record by way of supplementary affidavit and that earlier payments were also released without insisting upon approval of the vouchers. Accordingly, it is submitted that the petitioner is entitled to the balance amount claimed in the Writ petition.

12. Having heard the parties and upon considering the material available on record, this Court finds that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing C.W.J.C. No.13556 of 2021 seeking payment of the outstanding bills arising out of the same work. The said Writ petition was disposed of by order dated 09.03.2022 and, pursuant thereto, the respondent authorities examined the petitioner's claim and released the amount found admissible in accordance with the approved work orders and verified vouchers.

13. From the counter affidavit, it appears that the respondents have specifically stated that the balance amount claimed by the petitioner is



not supported by any work order issued by the competent authority and that the vouchers relied upon by him have neither been approved nor verified. The petitioner has not been able to place any cogent material on record to satisfactorily dislodge the aforesaid stand of the respondents.

14. This Court further finds that, in substance, the present Writ petition seeks the very same relief which was the subject matter of C.W.J.C. No.13556 of 2021. Once the earlier Writ petition has already been disposed of and the directions issued therein have been complied with by examining the claim and releasing the admissible amount, the petitioner cannot maintain a second Writ petition seeking substantially the same relief, particularly in the absence of any fresh cause of action or challenge to the action taken pursuant to the earlier order.

15. In the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is made out. The petitioner



has failed to establish any enforceable legal right to claim the balance amount.

16. Accordingly, the Writ petition stands dismissed.

17. Interlocutory Application, if any, shall stands disposed of.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Spd/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24.07.2026
Transmission Date	

