

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7011 of 2015

=====

1. Chinta Mani Pandey @ Balister Pandey
2. Ajay Kumar Pandey
3. Shailesh Kumar Pandey All sons of Sri Bishwanath Pandey, Resident of Village-
Chanayan Bandth, P.S.- Majhauria, District- West Champaran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Civil
Supplies, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Civil Supplies, Govt. of Bihar, Patna
3. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Sone
Bhawan, 5th Floor, Birchand Patel Path, Patna
4. The District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Bettiah,
West Champaran
5. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Bettiah, West Champaran
6. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bettiah Sadar, Bettiah, District- West Champaran
7. The District Supply Officer, Bettiah, West Champaran
8. The Enforcement Officer-cum-Circle Officer, Majhauria Block, District- West
Champaran
9. The Block Agriculture Officer, Majhauria Block, Majhauria, District- West Champaran
10. The Incharge, Paddy Purchase Centre, Majhauria Block, District- West Champaran
11. The Union of India, through the Secretary, Department of Food and Civil Supplies,
Govt. of India, New Delhi
12. The Secretary, Department of Food and Civil Supplies, Govt. of India, New Delhi

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar
For the BSFC Mr. Amrendra Nr. Rai
For the State Mr. Raj Nandan Prasad- SC-9
Mr. S.Krishna A.C. to SC-9

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

3 27-07-2015 Heard Mr. Sanjeev Kumar in support of the writ petition
and Mr. A.N. Rai for the respondent-Bihar State Food and Civil
Supplies Corporation (for short 'the Corporation').

The three petitioners herein are the framers who claim to
have grown paddy. They have sought a direction upon the
respondents to extend the date for purchase of paddy directly
from the agriculturists like the petitioners. Other relief(s) have

also been prayed. The writ petition, however, does not set out any pleading supported by document(s) obligating the Corporation to directly purchase the paddy from the farmers.

In the counter affidavit of the respondent- Corporation it has been categorically stated that paddy is not purchased directly from the agriculturist. In exceptional cases, the same are purchased after obtaining permission of the concerned authority. Normally, farmers are required to sell paddy through the PACS under the procurement scheme. Time of procurement of paddy has lapsed/crossed. Now it is paddy growing season. The petitioner has not shown anything in support of their claim at this belated stage.

In view of pleading(s) in the writ petition which lacks in particulars, the statements made in the counter affidavit and the facts noticed hereinabove, in my view, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. The application is dismissed.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

U			
---	--	--	--