

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13294 of 2011

=====

Amit Kumar Sah @ Amit Kumar S/O Rajendra Prasad Sah, R/O At-Barahat, P.S.-
Barahat, Distt.-Banka.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Rural Development Deptt., Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Distt. Banka.
3. The District Magistrate, Banka.
4. The Block Development Officer Block-Banka, Distt.-Banka.
5. The Block Development Officer Block-Amarpur, Distt.-Banka.
6. The Block Development Officer Block-Belhar, Distt.-Banka.
7. The Block Development Officer Block-Fullidumar, Distt.-Banka.
8. The Block Development Officer Block-Rajaun, Distt.-Banka.
9. The Block Development Officer Block-Katoria, Distt.-Banka.
10. The Block Development Officer Block-Chandan, Distt.-Banka.
11. The Block Development Officer Block-Shambhuganj, Distt.-Banka.
12. The Executive Engineer, Rural Development Circle 2, Banka.
13. The Executive Engineer, Rural Development Circle 1, Baunsi, Banka.
14. The Executive Engineer, Minor Irrigation, Works Division Banka.
15. The Junior Engineer, Rural Development Circle 2, Banka.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : None

For the Respondents : Mr. R.B.N Singh, AC to GA-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-10-2018

As none appeared on behalf of the petitioner, the matter was passed over for a few cases. However on repeat call, the petitioner was against not represented.

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

“For issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus to not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner for the realization of money for the residue deteriorated rice inasuch as neither in the scheme nor in the allotment order



there was any condition that the petitioner would have to pay the price for the balance rice but the authorities have been extending constant threats and pressure on the petitioner for the payment of the balance rice which admittedly could not be handed over due to inaction and latches on the part of the authorities for the non issuance of valid permits on the relevant time and there was a pre condition in the scheme that the rice was to be handed over only on the basis of valid permits.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and states that the Enquiry Commission headed by Hon’ble Mr. Justice Udai 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. Having regard to the stand of the respondents, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	09.10.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

