# IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6540 of 2002**

======================================================

M/S Harinagar Sugar Mills Ltd. a Company registered under the provisions of the Indian Companies Act, 1956, having its registered office at 207, Kolbadevi Road, Mumbai-400002 and its sugar factory at Harinagar, P.O. Harinagar, P.S.Ramnagr, District West Champaran through it's manager Satya Narayan Poddar holder of power of attorney on behalf of the company.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Bihar New Secretariate, Bailly Road, Patna
3. The Assistant Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Bagha Circle, Bagha, District West Champaran.

... ... Respondent/s

======================================================

**Appearance :**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr.Ramesh Kumar Agrawal |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr. Lalit Kishore (A.G.) |
| | | Mr. Vikash Kumar (SC 11) |
| | | Mr. D.K. Sinha |

======================================================

**CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**
**and**
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR**
**ORAL JUDGMENT**
**(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)**

**Date : 31-08-2020**

Petitioner has prayed for following relief (s) :-

i) To issue a writ of certiorari for quashing the notification bearing No.S.O.92 dated 25.7.2001 (Annexure-2) issued under the provisions of the Bihar Tax on entry of goods into local areas for consumption, use or sale therein Act, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Bihar Entry Tax Act' only) by which entry tax has been imposed on the notified goods on their entry in any local area of the State of Bihar from outside the state of Bihar.

ii) To hold that the provisions of the Bihar Entry Tax Act are not applicable to the purchases of the notified goods made by the petitioner in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

iii) To issue writ of mandamus commanding the respondents not to apply the provisions of the Bihar Entry Tax Act and Rules framed thereunder and not to demand entry tax on the purchases made by the petitioner.

iv) To quash the consequential notices dated 12.10.2001 (Annexure-3), 15.2.2002 (Annexure-5) and 1.4.2002 (Annexure-6) issued by the respondent Assistant Commissioner of Commercial Taxes for compliance of the provisions of the Bihar Entry Tax Act.

v) To any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the case.

The present petition was tagged along with the other cases of similar nature and listed for hearing before different Benches from time to time.

In effect, the petitioner challenged the Constitutional validity of different provisions of the Bihar Tax on Entry of Goods into Local Area for Consumption, Use or Sale Therein Act, 1993, as amended from time to time.

It is a matter of record that Hon'ble the Apex Court vide judgment dated 14th of July, 2006 passed in Civil Appeal No. 3453 of 2002, titled as **M/s. JINDAL STAINLESS Ltd. & ANR. Vs. STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.** had permitted the parties, before the Supreme Court, to place within two months additional material in the concerned writ petitions.

In most of the cases, such an additional material was not placed by the parties, perhaps for the reason that the issue decided in terms of the said judgment was pending consideration before a Larger Bench of Hon'ble the Apex Court.

Subsequently, a Constitution Bench (Nine Judges) of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **JINDAL STAINLESS LIMITED & ANOTHER VS. STATE OF HARYANA & OTHERS, reported in (2017) 12 SCC 1**, after examining the correctness of the decision rendered in the case of **Jindal Stainless Ltd. (2) and another Vs. State of Haryana and others, reported in (2006) 7 SCC 241** has observed as under:

> "1159. By majority the Court answers the reference in the following terms:
>
> 1159.1. Taxes simpliciter are not within the contemplation of Part XIII of the Constitution of India. The word "free" used in Article 301 does not mean "free from taxation".
>
> 1159.2. Only such taxes as are discriminatory in nature are prohibited by Article 304(a). It follows that levy of a non-discriminatory tax would not constitute an infraction of Article 301.
>
> 1159.3. Clauses (a) and (b) of Article 304 have to be read disjunctively.

1159.4. A levy that violates Article 304(a) cannot be saved even if the procedure under Article 304(b) or the proviso thereunder is satisfied.

1159.5. The Compensatory Tax Theory evolved in *Automobile Transport case*[3] and subsequently modified in *Jindal's case*[8] has no juristic basis and is therefore rejected.

1159.6. The decisions of this Court in *Atiabari*[2], *Automobile Transport*[3] and Jindal[8] cases and all other judgments that follow these pronouncements are to the extent of such reliance overruled.

1159.7. A tax on entry of goods into a local area for use, sale or consumption therein is permissible although similar goods are not produced within the taxing State.

1159.8. Article 304 (a) frowns upon discrimination (of a hostile nature in the protectionist sense) and not on mere differentiation. Therefore, incentives, set-offs etc. granted to a specified class of dealers for a limited period of time in a non-hostile fashion with a view to developing economically backward areas would not violate Article 304(a). The question whether the levies in the present case indeed satisfy this test is left to be determined by the regular Benches hearing the matters.

1160. States are well within their right to design their fiscal legislations to ensure that the tax burden on goods imported from other States and goods produced within the State fall equally. Such measures if taken would not contravene Article 304(a) of the Constitution. The question whether the levies in the present case indeed satisfy this test is left to be determined by the regular Benches hearing the matters.

1161. The questions whether the entire State can be notified as a local area and whether entry tax can be levied on goods entering the landmass of India from another country are left open to be determined in appropriate proceedings."

Perhaps, the only surviving issue requiring consideration by this Court is the one pointed out in Paragraph 1161, reproduced supra.

However, after the matter was heard for some time, we find the record to be totally silent on facts or grounds with regard thereto. No doubt, the issue is purely legal. But even the relevant provisions of the Statute claimed to be ultra vires are not on record and the reason is not far to seek for the petition was filed way back in the year, 2002 and the Legislation was amended/enforced subsequently. That apart, even during the course of hearing we found absolute incoherence with regard thereto.

As such, we are of the considered view that each one of the petitioners file a fresh petition placing on record not only the specific legislation or part thereof, Constitutional validity whereof they wish to challenge, as also specify the grounds, in addition to the one reproduced supra.

This they are permitted to do so within a period of eight weeks on the same and subsequent cause of action. We notice that there are no interim orders in favour of the petitioner. As and when such petition is filed, the same shall be considered for hearing on priority basis.

Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Interlocutory Application, if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(Sanjay Karol, CJ)**

**( S. Kumar, J)**

chn/-

| | |
|---|---|
| **AFR/NAFR** | |
| **CAV DATE** | |
| **Uploading Date** | 5.9.2020 |
| **Transmission Date** | |