

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20969 of 2013

=====

Basudeo Prasad, S/O Late Ram Swarup Rai (Yadav) Resident of Village
Chandan Bakhri, P.S. Ahiyapur, District Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Director, Cattle & Fishery Sansadhan Department, Dairy Development Directorate, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Additional Secretary, Finance Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Dairy Development Officer, Sitamarhi.
5. The Branch Head, Bank of Baroda, Uma Nagar Branch, Sitamarhi.
6. The Managing Director, Timul Dairy Development, Sahkari Sangh Ltd., Muzaffarpur.
7. Deputy General Manager, Bank of Baroda.
8. District Dairy Development Officer, Sitamarhi.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Diwakar Prasad Karn, Advocate

For the Respondents : Ms. Jahan Ara, AC to AAG 5

For the Bank : Mr. Sanjeev Shankar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

3 14-08-2015 The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to release the loan amount for dairy development scheme and release subsidy for the dairy project.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an amount of Rs.45,50,775/- had been sanctioned for 40 persons and the petitioner ought to have been released the sanctioned amount in his case.

3. Without entering into the details and merit of the matter, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the writ petition has become infructuous as within the stipulated

period of four months under the terms and conditions of sanction of loan, the applicant did not turn up for execution of loan documents and as such, the application of the petitioner had to be returned. It is further submitted that since the budgetary provision for subsidy under the scheme for the current year had been exhausted, the processing of applications was suspended in terms of the letter dated 05.07.2012 issued by the NABARD.

4. The above averment/stand of the respondent-Bank in the counter affidavit has not been disputed by the petitioner.

5. In that view of the matter, this Court is of the view that the writ petition has become infructuous and is dismissed as such.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

U			
---	--	--	--