

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 17148 of 2015
Along with
Interlocutory Application No. 1669 of 2016

=====

Harinagar Sugar Mills Ltd., a company registered under the provision of the Indian Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at 207, Kalbadevi Road, Mumbai and its Sugar Factory at Harinagar, P.O.- Harinagar, P.S.- Ramnagar, District- West Champaran through its Chief General Manager, S.L. Baheti, son of Late Puran Mal Baheti and General Manager (Finance) G.K. Chandak, son of Late Mangi Lal Chandak, Both resident of Harinagar Sugar Mill Compound P.O. Harinagar P.S. Ramnagar and District- West Champaran, holders of power of attorney on behalf of the Company.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Cane Commissioner, Sugarcane Industries Department, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna-1.
3. The Joint Cane Commissioner, Sugarcane Industries Department, Government of Bihar, New Secretariat, Patna-1.
4. M/s HPCL Biofuels Limited, NH-28B, Lauriya- Bagaha Road, Lauriya-845453, District West Champaran (Bihar) through its General Manager.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. R. K. Agrawal Mr. Shive Kumar Advocates.
For the State	:	Mr. Rajesh Singh, G.P. 16.
For the M/s HPCL BIOFUELS Ltd	:	Mr. Ranjit Sharan, Advocate. Mr. Laxmi Narayan Das, Advocate.
For the Intervenor	:	Mr. R. S. Roy, Sr. Advocate. Mr. Binod Kumar Singh, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 25-02-2016

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Re: Interlocutory Application No. 1669 of 2016

The Interlocutory Application has been filed purportedly by the villagers, who are affected by the issue involved in the present writ application, for intervention in opposition to the writ petition, the ostensible reason being to safeguard the

interest of farmers of their village.

Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties, in view of the fact that the Court is mindful of the interest of the farmers, it is not deemed necessary to implead them as formal parties.

Accordingly, Interlocutory Applications No. 1669 of 2016 stands disposed off.

Re: Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 17148 of 2015

The present writ application has been filed challenging order bearing Memo No. 2307 dated 24.09.2015 passed by the respondent no. 2 to the extent it has cancelled and reviewed the earlier order bearing Memo No. 2155 dated 24.09.2014 reserving a non traditional village Piparahiya situated in Block Yogapatti in the District of West Champaran in favour of the petitioner and has reserved it afresh with the respondent no. 4 for the crushing seasons 2015-16 to 2019-20 (5 years) as a traditional village.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was earlier a settlement of non traditional villages including the village in question for the crushing seasons 2014-15 to 2016-17 in terms of order dated 01.09.2014 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 13980 of 2014. He submits that despite the said order having been passed in the presence of the authorities concerned including the respondent no. 4 as well as the representative body of the villages concerned and attaining finality, the respondents have reopened the matter and upon reviewing the earlier order dated 24.09.2014 have issued the impugned order by which one



non traditional village has been taken away from the reserved pool/cluster of the petitioner and has been settled with the respondent no. 4 treating it to be a traditional village, for five years from 2015-16 to 2019-20. It is submitted that the said review is all the more illegal for the reason that under the garb of the petitioner being noticed and called upon to appear before the Department by letter contained in Memo No. 1592 dated 15.07.2015 and Letter No. 156 dated 25.08.2015 for settlement of traditional villages for the next five years from crushing season 2015-16, the order dated 24.09.2014 being reviewed, the settlement of the village in question which was a non traditional, cannot be sustained. Learned counsel submits that though various reasons have been given but neither the proposal asked for nor opportunity given to the petitioner to explain or counter the charges, such a decision could not have been taken moreso, in view of the fact that as per the orders of the High Court and the law settled, the reservation of non traditional villages has to be for three years whereas the traditional ones for five years. Learned counsel submits that this settlement for three years of non traditional and five years for traditional villages was also in terms of the specific direction in the aforesaid referred writ petition in which it was clearly stipulated that the authorities shall act in accordance with the decision of the Court in the case of **M/s Vishnu Sugar Mills Limited v. State of Bihar** reported in **2005(2) PLJR 495** which has been affirmed by a Division Bench in the judgment reported in **2011 (1) BBCJ 202**. Learned counsel



submits that once the original order having been passed pursuant to specific direction of the Court and the period also having been stipulated in the judgment itself, any change in the period or review was not permissible without taking prior approval of the Court. Learned counsel submits that in that view of the matter, any subsequent decision is in the teeth of the specific order of the Court and not only makes the order unsustainable but also the authority liable to be proceeded against for acting in violation of the law settled by the Courts. Learned counsel submits that even on facts, the order impugned is erroneous as taking into account the ultimate interest of the farmers, the original order dated 24.09.2014 was based on a decision taken in the joint meeting of the stake-holders on 22.09.2014 in which it was specifically discussed that the payment to the farmers is satisfactory as far as the petitioner is concerned whereas dissatisfaction was expressed towards respondent no. 4 and further the recommendation of the Zonal Development Council, which is the competent advisory body, has also been taken note of. Learned counsel submits that even in the order impugned, despite noting that the said Council has recommended the matter in favour of the petitioner even for the current year, still the authority concerned has taken a unilateral decision and gone ahead with allotting the said village to the respondent no. 4 treating it to be a traditional village. Learned counsel submits that the timing of the decision also is relevant as it is at the threshold of the crushing season so as to prejudice the interest of the petitioner and cause loss to it for

oblique reasons which are not justifiable either on facts or in law.

Learned counsel for the State submits that the decision was taken in the interest of the parties and the farmers in particular, as ultimately the Government's role is to ensure that the farmers get the best deal. It is submitted that the order impugned itself indicates that there was complaint from the farmers and thus the decision as contained in the order impugned cannot be faulted. Learned counsel submits that even the action of the petitioner in straight away moving to the High Court was premature as there is a statutory forum of appeal before the Principal Secretary of the Sugarcane Department, which is equally efficacious.

Learned counsel for the respondent no. 4 submits that technically he has no role in the present dispute as it was the farmers who had agitated before the authority leading to the village in question being reserved in its favour. However, he submits that going by the actual location of the village, it would transpire that the same is surrounded by villages reserved in favour of the respondent no. 4 and thus from the point of view of convenience and maintaining continuity in the blocks allotted to various parties, the village in question more appropriately fits into and forms a cohesive part of the Block allotted to the respondent no. 4. He also contests the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that payment is not prompt by the respondent no. 4.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, by way of reply submits that the objection of the State with regard to



maintainability of the present writ petition in view of there being alternative remedy is not sustainable in the present facts of the case for the reason that at the relevant time the Principal Secretary to whom the appeal lies and the Cane Commissioner, who has passed the impugned order were one and the same person and thus there could not have been any occasion or justification in moving before him and under those circumstances, the petitioner had moved directly to the High Court and further the order being wholly without jurisdiction and also in violation of the principles of natural justice, availability of alternative remedy is not a bar for moving before the High Court directly under its writ jurisdiction.

At this juncture, learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner did have an effective alternative remedy as on the day when the hearing was initiated in the High Court, the Principal Secretary was a different person and thus there could not have been any controversy or issue with regard to moving before him.

Learned counsel for the petitioner rebutting the said stand of the learned State counsel submits that when cause of action arose and also when the petitioner had approached the High Court, both the posts were held by one and the same person who had passed the impugned order and thus any development subsequent to filing of the writ petition would not render the writ petition as not maintainable and also the issue being of an urgent nature and having been heard at length by the Court, relegating

the petitioner to the appellate authority at this stage, as an alternative remedy would be iniquitous. He further submits that the impugned order having been passed by a senior officer of the State Government of the level of the Principal Secretary, any successor to that office cannot be expected to objectively consider an appeal of an order passed by a person of equivalent status and position and thus moving before him would be a futile exercise.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the Court finds substance in the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner. The authority having exercised its power of reserving villages in favour of the sugar mills and that too pursuant to the direction of the Court, cannot be allowed to keep shifting its stand or reviewing its order without adhering to the proper recourse of getting the Court order either reviewed or modified so as to permit it to reopen the issue. Moreover, on facts also the notice to the petitioner to forward its proposal through the local authorities to the Department for settlement of non traditional villages for the next five crushing seasons cannot be construed to be a notice as to why the settlement already made in its favour be also reviewed and reopened. Even the period for such settlement having been indicated and fixed, as per the specific order of the Court, the said exercise, in the manner in which it has been done, is not proper. The materials on record and the intervention petition having been filed in opposition to the writ petition also indicates that there may be local politics involved.

However, the Court is not getting into such controversy but would only like to reiterate that the interest of the farmers are foremost and this Court would not shut its eye from safeguarding the same.

In light of the discussions made hereinabove, in the considered opinion of the Court, the order impugned cannot be sustained and accordingly, the same, contained in Memo No. 2307 dated 24.09.2015 issued by the respondent no. 2, as far as it relates to reserving Piprahiya village in favour of respondent no. 4, stands quashed. As a result, the reservation of the said village in favour of the petitioner of Block-Yogapatti, District-West Champaran in terms of order contained in Memo No. 2155 dated 24.09.2014, stands revived. The parties shall ensure that the fruits of the order in favour of the party concerned is not allowed to be frustrated for any technical reason.

The Court further directs that the farmers should not be put to any inconvenience with regard to selling their sugarcane and it would be bought at places keeping in mind their convenience and ensuring that they have to cover the shortest possible distance and payment is prompt.

The writ petition stands disposed off in the aforementioned terms.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

U			
---	--	--	--