

(2017) 03 JH CK 0043
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : 2268 of 2015

Arundhwaj Prasad Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Jharkhand through Secretary

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-03-2017

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2017) 03 JH CK 0043

Hon'ble Judges : Aparesh Kumar Singh

Bench : SINGLE BENCH

Advocate : Deepak Kr. Dubey

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

1. No one appears for the petitioner. Counsel for the Respondents is present.
2. It appears that there has been no representation on behalf of the petitioner before the Lawazma Board and matter has been adjourned on successive occasions on the prayer made by its behalf.
3. Essentially, claim of the petitioner is for payment of dues towards supplies of foodgrains to the residential schools, as per the decision at Annexure-3 dated 08.06.2013 of the District Purchase Committee presided over by the Deputy Development Commissioner, Ranchi. Petitioner has contended that after participating in the tender process vide Annexure-1 and thereafter in terms of letter dated 08.06.2013 (Annexure-3), he undertook the supply without any complain. Respondents have issued fresh tender in the newspaper with regard to the supply of materials for which tender was allotted earlier in his favour. Petitioner again participated in the tender in which he was found lowest bidder. According to him, some persons have been paid their dues relating to supplies made, but the petitioner has not yet been paid any amount.
4. Enclosed documents to the supplementary affidavit of the petitioner contains the minutes dated 08.06.2013 which is already on record as Annexure-3 to the

writ petition and certain bills raised by one Ramesh Kumar. No such proof of supplies made on the part of the petitioner has been enclosed either in the writ petition or in the supplementary affidavit. The averments are lacking with supporting documents. Even otherwise, in the claim relating to the contractual dues, no specific agreement or work order in the name of the petitioner is brought on record. In such circumstances involving disputed questions of fact, this Court is therefore not inclined to interfere in the matter. Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed.