

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11961 of 2013**

=====

Satya Narayan Rai, Son Of Late Sita Ram Rai, Resident of Village and P.O. Bela,  
P.S. Dariyapur, District - Sara at Chapra

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Secretary, Food & Civil Supplies, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Development Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra, District Saran at Chapra
5. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Saran at Chapra, District - Saran at Chapra
6. The Director, District Rural Development Agency, Saran at Chapra, District - Saran at Chapra
7. The Block Development Officer, Dariyapur, District - Saran at Chapra

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. S.B.K. Manglam,  
Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Advocates

For the Respondents : Mrs. Kumari Amrita, GP 10

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**

ORAL JUDGMENT

**Date: 13-09-2018**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the  
following reliefs –

*“(i) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature  
of Certiorari for quashing the order dated 09.05.2013  
passed by the Respondent no. 7 and contained in his  
letter no. 716 dated 09.05.2013, whereby and where  
under the Respondent no.7 has been pleased to direct  
the petitioner for deposit of a sum of Rs. 1,05,887/- in  
the Block Nazarat against the total value of un-*



*disbursed food grains of Sampoorn Gramin Rojgar Yojana, failing which appropriate action would be taken.*

*(ii) For a declaration that if for the lapses of the Respondents the food grain (rice) of Sampoorn Gramin Rojgar Yojana lifted by the petitioner during the financial year 2005-06 could not be utilized and the rice being a perishable food grains was allowed to be rotten in the godown of the petitioner which he destroyed after due information to the Respondents, the Respondents cannot put a demand for realization of the amount of rotten rice from the petitioner in 2013 and he cannot be faulted for any lapses of the Respondents.*

*(iii) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioner shall be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that pursuant to the orders of this Court, the Enquiry Commission headed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Uday Sinha (Retired) has now submitted its report and any further action in relation to recovery of the value of undistributed rice under the SGRY Scheme would abide by the decision of the State Government to be taken on the basis of such report.

4. In the above view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition



with liberty to approach this Court afresh as and when the occasion arises in future.

5. Having regard to the stand of the petitioner, the writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

**(Vikash Jain, J)**

B.T/Chandran

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | N.A.       |
| Uploading Date    | 17.09.2018 |
| Transmission Date | N.A.       |

