

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9499 of 2016

=====

Ram Swaroop Yadav, S/o late Pulkit Yadav, R/o Vill- Madhiya, Block- Basopatti,
Distt- Madhubani.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Agriculture Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate Madhubani.
5. The District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Madhubani.
6. The District Co-operative Officer, Madhubani.
7. The District Chairman, Co-operative Bank, Madhubani.
8. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Madhubani.
9. The Deputy Collector of Land Reformer, Sadar Madhubani.
10. The Circle Inspector, Basopatti, Madhubani.
11. The Executive Assistant, State Food Corporation, Basopatti, Madhubani.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Bhushan Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha- GA9

For the Corporation : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-10-2018

The petitioner claims himself to be the Chairman of
Madhiya Primary Agricultural Co-operative Society. He has filed
this writ petition in his individual capacity and not in the capacity of



the Chairman.

2. His prayer in the present petition is to direct the respondent authorities to pay the cost of paddy of the farmers, who had deposited the paddy before the purchase center.

3. By order dated 20.06.2016, this Court had directed him to file documents by way of supplementary affidavit reflecting the supply details. Till date, no such affidavit has been filed. Even the name of farmers who supplied the paddy has not been mentioned in the writ petition. The pleadings are too vague.

4. In absence of detail of supply of paddy before the purchase center of the Bihar State Food and Civil Supply Corporation and in absence of any document in support thereof no writ in the nature of mandamus can be issued against the respondents.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition being devoid of any merit, is dismissed.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J.)

Sanjeet/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12.10.2018
Transmission Date	NA

