fron

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. 1969 /2003

PETITIONER

Control of State of the State o

RESPONDENTS



Laisanlang

M/s. LAXMANBHAI CONSTRUCTION (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED COMPANY

BUILDING & CIVIL ENGINEERING CONTRACTORS,

Duly incorporated and Registerd under the Indian Companies Act, 1956, bearing registration No. 30171/83, having it's Registered Office at 97, Bajaj Bhawan, Nariman Point, Mumbai - 400 021.

Versus

- (1) STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

 Through it's Secretary,

 Department of Energy and Natural Resources,

 Sachivalaya,

 Bhopal (M.P.)
- (2) MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY BOARD, Through it's Chairman, Rampur, Jabalpur (M.P.)
- (3) STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,
 Through it's Secretary,
 Department of Energy Mantralaya,
 D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
- (4) CHHATTISGARH STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
 Through it's Chairman,
 Raipur (C.G.)
- (5) THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
 (Civil Maintenance)
 (Madhya Pradesh Electricity Board)
 Now Chhattisgarh State Electricity Board,
 Korba (West)Distt. Korba (C.G.)



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 & 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION AND OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS, ORDER OR ORDERS, DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS:

<u>HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR</u>

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 1969 OF 2003

Petitioner

M/s. Laxmanbhai Construction

Pr. Ltd.

Versus

Respondents

State.

State of Madhya Pradesh & 4

Others.

Shri K.N. Nande, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Sourabh Sharma, counsel for the respondent No.4.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the

ORAL ORDER

(28th April, 2006)

- 1. I.A. No. 9562/2005 and I.A. No. 4438/2006, applications for withdrawal of the writ petition.
- 2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that in view of the establishment of the Arbitration Tribunal, the relief claimed in this petition has become infructuous, to which learned counsel appearing for the respondents, have no objection. The applications are ordered, as prayed for.
- 3. Consequently, the writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

Sd/-Satish K. Agnihotri Judge

apus