

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10203 of 2014

=====

Birendra Kumar Singh, Advocate, son of Late Krishna Ballabh Singh,
resident of Village- Jhikatia, P.O.- Maigra, P.S- Imamganj, District- Gaya

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Gaya
3. The S.D.O., Sherghati, District- Gaya.
4. The Block Development Officer, Imamganj, District- Gaya.
5. The Circle Officer, Imamganj, District- Gaya
6. The Block Agriculture Officer, Imamganj, District- Gaya
7. The Marketing Officer, Imamganj, Gaya

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Birendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Ajay, G.A.-12

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE I. A. ANSARI

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

10 05-01-2015 The petitioner claims to be a farmer of Gaya district. His grievance is that though the Government fixed the minimum support price (MSP) for paddy at Rs.1360/- per quintal for the previous crop season, the concerned authorities did not purchase the paddy produced by him and left with no option, he had to sell it in the open market at Rs.1000/- per quintal. He seeks appropriate directions in this behalf.

On receipt of the notice issued by this Court, respondents have filed their respective counter affidavits. They

have furnished the particulars of the purchases undertaken by the department in Gaya district as well as the quantity of paddy purchased at minimum support price (MSP). It is submitted that the petitioner did not name anyone in the department alleging that his paddy was not purchased.

Heard Mr.Birendra Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Mr.Ajay, learned Government Advocate No.12, appearing for the respondents.

It is too well known that the minimum support price for agricultural produce is fixed by the Government to encourage the farmers and ensure that they are not exploited by indiscriminate merchants.

The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondents did not make arrangement for purchase of the paddy produced by him. If what is stated is found to be true, it is a matter of serious concern and the official, who is responsible for it, needs to be proceeded against. However, the writ petitioner is silent about the date on which the petitioner offered the agricultural produce for sale, much less an official is named. The petitioner did not submit any complaint in this behalf. Further, he did not choose to file any reply contradicting any version of the respondents.

Be that as it may, we dispose of the writ petition directing the respondents that in case the petitioner approaches any purchase centre for sale of the paddy in the current or coming season, the authority shall purchase the same at the minimum support price.

(L. Narasimha Reddy,CJ)

(I. A. Ansari, J)

PNM

U			
---	--	--	--