

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Letters Patent Appeal No.1430 of 2017
IN
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 9569 of 2017**

=====

Anil Kumar Singh, Son of Late Dwarika Prasad Singh, Resident of Village-
Dewaka Kaithi, P.S.- Chautham, District- Khagaria.

.... Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Cooperative Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Managing Director-cum- Nodal Officer, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Khagaria.
5. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Khagaria.
6. The Deputy Collector Land Reforms, Khagaria.
7. The District Cooperative Officer, Khagaria.
8. The District Supply Officer, Khagaria.
9. The Circle Officer, Chautham, Khagaria.
10. The Block Cooperative Officer, Chautham, Khagaria.
11. The Director-cum- Nodal Officer of Surplus Paddy Acquisition.
12. The Director-cum- District Rural Department Officer, Khagaria.
13. The District Manager-cum- Godown Incharge, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd., Khagaria.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 13-11-2017

In the matter of refund of outstanding dues to the
appellant amounting to Rs.20,91,552/- against supply made CMR to
the rice miller in terms of the State Policy, the writ petition was filed
by the petitioner has been disposed of by making the following
observations:-



“6. Let the petitioner produce all the documents before the managing Director, Bihar State Food and Corporation. If the Managing Director satisfied that in fact the petitioner is the person, who has procured the paddy from the respective farmers, who have got themselves enrolled and the money has been transferred to their respective accounts so much so the petitioner produces the RTGS/NEFT note, the admitted amount will be paid to the petitioner as early as possible.

“7. For convenience, the petitioner is directed to file an application, attaching the order of this court as well as the relevant documents supporting the claim of the petitioner before the Managing Director. The entire exercise should be completed by the Managing Director within a period of three months from the date of filing of application by the petitioner.”

Even though the learned counsel by referring to various documents tried to indicate that the matter may be examined and mandamus be issued to allow the claim of the petitioner. But as that the learned Writ Court has directed the petitioner to produce the relevant supporting documents supporting the claim of the petitioner before the Managing Director of the Corporation and he has been directed to examine the claim we see no reason to interfere in the matter at this stage.

We see no error in the order warranting reconsideration. The



appeal is therefore dismissed.

(Rajendra Menon, CJ)

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

mrl./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	15/11/2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

