

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11738 of 2015

- =====
1. Sheet Basant Kumar S/o Late Basudeo Prasad, Vill. Dokha Mathia, P.O. - Sadaber, P.S. - Dulhin Bazar Patna. Also Elected Chairman of Sadabeh Doraba Primary Agriculture Co-operative Credit Society.
 2. Krishna Murari Singh, S/o Late Lekh Narayan Singh, R/o Vill Dharampura Kharava, P.O. - Lala Bhadsara, P.S. - Dulhin Bazar Patna. Also Elected Chairman of Salhori Belhori Primary Agriculture Co-operative Credit Society.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary State of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Registrar, Co-operative Department, Patna Bihar.
4. The Managing Director Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Son Bhawan, Patna.
5. District Magistrate, Patna.
6. District Co-operative Officer, Patna.
7. Ran Vijay Umesh Kumar Singh, Kendra Prabhari cum Block Co-Operative Extension Officer Dulhin Bazar, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Shashi Kant Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent-State	:	Mr. Dhananjay Kumar, A.C. to G.P.16
For the S.F.C.	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

9 05-01-2016 Heard Mr. Shashi Kant Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Dhananjay Kumar, learned A.C. to G.P.16 for the State and Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh for the Corporation.

There are two writ petitioners and both are Chairman of different cooperative societies. Each of the petitioners complains of short payment by the Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation. Whereas the petitioner no. 1 complains non payment of 928 quintals of paddy supply, on the other hand petitioner no. 2

complains non payment of 666.80 quintals of paddy.

A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Corporation in which it was stated that whatsoever paddy has been supplied by the two petitioners, the payments have been made. It is further stated that in so far as the claim raised in the present writ petition is concerned, there is no evidence to support the supply. A counter affidavit has also been filed on behalf of the Sub-Divisional Officer in which it is stated that no paddy was found at the purchase centre.

Although, Mr. Kumar has referred to annexures to the writ petition to submit that his complaint was acted upon but in view of the disputed nature of contest where the supply itself is put to question, it raises the dispute in between the petitioners and the purchase centre incharge.

In these circumstances no direction can be issued by this Court. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of leaving it open for the petitioners to pursue their remedy as available to them in law for redressal of their grievances.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

deepika/Bibhash-

U			
---	--	--	--