

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD**

Writ Petition No.43922 of 2017

Order : (Per the Hon'ble The Acting Chief Justice Ramesh Ranganathan)

Heard Sri R. Raghunandan, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, and the learned Government Pleader for Agriculture, and, with their consent, the Writ Petition is disposed of at the stage of admission.

The petitioners herein had earlier invoked the jurisdiction of this Court to declare the order passed by the Chairman, District Level Compensation Committee, and the District Collector, Krishna, in proceedings dated 1.5.2017 directing the petitioners to pay a total compensation of Rs.36,05,490/- to the farmers, as arbitrary and illegal.

The contention urged before the earlier Division Bench was that a copy of the inspection report was not furnished to the petitioners, and they were denied the opportunity to put forth their submissions on the inspection report. The Division Bench, by its order in W.P. No. 18171 of 2017 dated 20.6.2017, set aside the order for violation of principles of natural justice, and directed the District Level Committee to pass an order afresh and in accordance with law. Consequent thereto, a copy of the inspection report appears to have been made available to the petitioners, and thereafter the impugned order came to be passed on 12.12.2017.

While the petitioners furnished a detailed reply to the show cause notice, by their letters dated 5.12.2017 and 11.12.2017, the impugned order merely records that the explanation submitted by them was not convincing, and has not been considered by the District Level Compensation Committee. Exercise of jurisdiction, by the District Level Compensation Committee, to determine the compensation payable to farmers, for having supplied them spurious or defective seeds, is quasi

judicial in character. One of the requirements, for a valid order, is that the authority should assign reasons why the contentions, urged by the petitioners in reply to show cause notice, do not merit acceptance. Except stating that their reply was not convincing, the impugned order does not even record as to how and why the Chairman of the District Level Compensation Committee came to such a conclusion. The impugned order is bereft of reasons and is, therefore, set aside. The 2nd respondent shall pass a reasoned order afresh and in accordance with law, at the earliest and in any event not later than two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly. Miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, shall also stand disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.



RAMESH RANGANATHAN, ACJ

GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD, J

3rd January, 2018

pnb

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD**



Writ Petition No.43922 of 2017

3.1.2018

pnb