

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15040 of 2015

=====

Manganj West Primary Agriculture Credit Cooperative Society Ltd. (in short PACS) at + P.O. Manganj West, P.S. Jadia, Block Triveniganj, District Supaul through its Chairman, Shri Bibesh Kumar Singh, S/o Late Dhanushdhari Prasad Singh, Resident of Ward No. 6, At + P.O. Manganj West, P.S. Jadia, Block - Triveniganj, District Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Co-operative, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Food & Civil Supplies, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone Bhawan, Veer Chand Patel Path, Patna.
5. The Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa.
6. The District Magistrate-cum-District Officer, Supaul.
7. The District Manager, Bihar State Food & Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Supaul.
8. The District Co-operative Officer, Supaul.
9. The Circle Officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul.
10. The Block Co-operative Extension Officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amrit Abhijat
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ritesh Kumar, SC-33
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			
---	--	--	--