

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15262 of 2015

=====

Katauna Primary Agriculture Credit Cooperative Society (PACCS), village-Katauna, P.S. and Block Katarisarai, District- Nalanda through its Chairman Subhash Chandra, son of Late Ram Lakhan Prasad, resident of village-Chachhu Bigha, P.S. Giriya, District- Nalanda.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Food & Civil Supplies Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation, Bihar, Patna, through its Managing Director.
3. The Collector, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
4. The District Cooperative Officer, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
5. The District Supply Officer, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
6. The District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
7. The Circle Officer, Katarisarai Block, District- Nalanda.
8. The Block Development Officer, Katarisarai Block, District- Nalanda.
9. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Department of Food and Public Distribution, New Delhi.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Nath Tiwary
For the Respondent-State	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, GA-3
For the Union of India	:	Mr. S.D. Sanjay, Addl. S.G.
For the Respondent-SFC	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 29-10-2015 Heard the parties.

In the present case the petitioner-cooperative society raises a grievance regarding non-lifting of paddy by the State Food Corporation.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and I have perused the records.

In the nature of the order passed by this Court in CWJC No.10728 of 2015 and analogous cases and in CWJC

No.11746 of 2015 and analogous cases, the petitioner having filed the writ petition after the expiry of the cut-off date fixed by the Union of India for delivery of custom milled rice which was fixed 31.8.2015, on the principles so laid down by this Court in the judgment referred to above, the petitioner is not found entitled to any indulgence and the writ petition is disposed of leaving it open for the petitioner to take recourse to such other remedy that may be available to him in law.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

SKPathak/-

U			
---	--	--	--