

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16918 of 2014

=====

Reliance Communication Ltd. having its registered office at H-Block, 1st Floor, Dhirubhai Ambani Knowledge City, Navi Mumbai and circle office at 7th Floor, Kashi Place, P.S. Kotwali, Patna through its authorized signatory Indrajit Mukhopadhyay son of Sri N.C. Mukhopadhyay, 7th Floor, Kashi Place, P.S. Kotwali, Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Housing, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Joint Secretary, Department of Urban Development and Housing, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Town Commissioner, Gaya Municipal Corporation, Gaya
4. Gaya Municipal Corporation through the Town Commissioner, Gaya

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajesh Ranjan, Mr.Shakti Suman Kumar, Advocates
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Lalit Kishore, AG Mr.Rabindra Kumar Priyadarshi, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 29-09-2020

Petitioner who is engaged in the business of telecommunications has established passive infrastructure, over private properties, at different places within the State of Bihar.

Concerning that, Respondent no.3 has issued notice(s) to the petitioner (Annexure-4 series) asking it to pay fee/charges in terms of and under the provisions of the Bihar



Communication Towers and Related Structures Rules, 2012.

(Referred to as the 2012 Rules).

Challenging these Rules as also the notice(s), Annexure-4 series, on 23/09/2014 petitioner filed the instant Petition praying for the following reliefs:

“(i) To issue an appropriate writ/order/direction to hold and declare clause (1) of sub section (1) of Section 127 of the Bihar Municipal Act, 2007 (hereinafter referred as the Act) inserted by Bihar Act 7 of 2011 as ultra vires the provisions as contained in Article 265 and 246 of the Constitution of India.

(ii) To issue an appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the Bihar Communication Towers and Related Structures Rules, 2012(hereinafter referred to as the Rule) as contained in Annexure-3 on the ground of same being illegal, ultra vires Article 265 and 246 of Constitution of India and suffering from vices of excessive delegation.

(iii) Consequent upon the quashing of the Rule as contained in Annexure-3, a writ of certiorari may be issued for quashing the demand notices annexed as Annexure-4 series whereby the respondent nos.3 has demanded tax/rent/fee from the petitioner company on the basis of the Rule and sought technical information regarding towers respectively.

(iv) To issue an appropriate writ/order/direction to hold and declare that the



petitioner is not liable to pay any registration fee and renewal fees to the Municipal Corporation/Municipal Council/Nagar Panchayat for its towers.

(v) To issue directions to the respondent authorities restraining them from taking any coercive action including sealing/demolition of towers during the pendency of the present writ application for the purpose of realizing the demand so raised in light of the impugned Rules.

(vi) To any other relief/relief(s) for which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

On 03.01.2014 this Court passed interim order to the following effect:-

“Heard Mr. Y.V. Giri, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Vikash Kumar, learned counsel for the State and Mr. Rabindra Priyadarshi, learned counsel for the Gaya Municipal Corporation.

Perused the order, dated 27.08.2012, passed in C.W.J.C. No.15373 of 2012, and the materials available on record.

Perused also the present writ petition and the material available on record.

The petitioner seeks to challenge the constitutional validity of Clause (I) inserted in Sub-section(1) of Section 127 of the Bihar Municipal Act, 2007 on the ground of legislative incompetence.

Notice be issued to the learned Advocate General.



Notice for hearing and final disposal of the writ petition be issued to the respondent nos.2 and 3, to be made returnable on 02.03.2015.

In tune with the direction, given by the order, dated 27.08.2012, aforementioned, it is hereby, in the interest of justice directed that pending the writ petition there shall not be coercive recovery from the writ petitioner pursuant to the demand dated 03.09.2014 on condition that the petitioner will, within two weeks from today, pay the registration fee of Rs. 50,000/- and renewal fee of Rs.15,000/- for the year 2014 for each tower constructed or installed by the petitioner within the limits of the respondent Gaya Municipal Corporation.

List this writ petition along with C.W.J.C. No. 15373 of 2012, C.W.J.C. No. 107 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 6989 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 2841 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2137 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25725 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 41 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2156 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2134 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2851 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25477 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 25540 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 2130 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2149 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 36 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 152 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2157 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25731 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 35 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 91 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25732 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 2159 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25646 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 418 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25730 of 2013, C.W.J.C. No. 2274 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 107 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 25733 of



2013, C.W.J.C. No. 232 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 2143 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4688 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4186 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4279 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4093 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4082 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4302 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4450 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4086 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4081 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 5035 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No.4330 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 4083 of 2014, C.W.J.C. No. 3159 of 2013 and C.W.J.C. No. 3300 of 2013.”

Learned counsel for the parties submit that the present petition be disposed of in view of the contentions recorded; observations made; and directions issued on 29.09.2020 in **CWJC No.3300 of 2013** titled as **ATC Telecom Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.**, making the same applicable, *mutatis mutandi*, also in the instant case.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner clarifies that the case of the petitioner is not covered to the extent of issuance of Bank Guarantee, for the amount stands deposited in terms of the interim order dated 23.12.2014, reproduced supra.

This Court on **29.09.2020** in **CWJC No.3300 of 2013** titled as **ATC Telecom Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.**, being the lead case had passed the following order:-



“4. On 18.04.2013, this Court rejected petitioners’ prayer seeking modification of interim relief in the following terms:-

“This application is made by the writ petitioners for modification of the interim relief so that the writ petitioners may give bank guarantee in lieu of the registration fee and the renewal fee.

Application is rejected.”

5. The matter was taken up to Hon’ble the Apex Court, wherein the parties to the instant *lis* were also parties and vide order dated 9th December, 2013 in **Civil Appeal Nos.11001-02 of 2013, titled as ATC India Tower Corp. Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Versus State of Bihar & Ors.**, the Court passed the following order:-

“Leave granted.

Heard Mr. Harish N. Salve, learned senior counsel appearing for the appellants and Mr. Ranjit Kumar, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents at some length.

Looking at the facts of the case, we request the High Court to dispose of the batch of Writ Petitions pending before it expeditiously, preferably within six months from the date of communication of this order to it.

In the meantime, the appellants shall give before the High Court a Bank Guarantee in respect of the amount which has been demanded so far and for the amount which they might have to pay by way of the demand, if raised in future.

It is made clear that there shall not be any interim refund in the meantime.

With the above observations and directions, the Civil Appeals are disposed of as allowed with no order as to costs.”

(Emphasis supplied)

6. However, subsequently, Hon’ble the Apex Court passed an order dated 04.11.2019 in **Petition (s) for**



**Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).25447/2019, titled as
Bharti Infratel Ltd. Versus The State of Bihar & Ors.**

which reads as under:-

“Application for exemption from filing official translation is allowed.

Application for permission to file additional documents/facts/annexures is allowed.

Issue notice.

There shall be no recovery under the new demands till the next date.

The towers sealed, in the meantime, be de-sealed.”

(Emphasis supplied)

7. It is not in dispute that this order continues to be in operation.

8. In the month of June 2020, all old matters of different categories (challenging the Constitutional Validity of Acts/ Income Tax/Sales Tax/ and other fiscal statutes) were listed for hearing.

9. On its turn, a bunch consisting of the present matter, being the lead case, was taken up and on 18th August, 2020, we had passed the following order:-

“Having heard learned counsel for the parties, Substitution Application is allowed.

Registry to make necessary correction in the memo of parties.

Re: CWJC No.3300 of 2013

As prayed for, list on 7th September, 2020.

Learned counsel for the State states that the pleadings of the case shall be transmitted through an electronic mode both to the learned counsel for the petitioner as also to the Court Master.

Wherever the Bank Guarantee furnished by the petitioner has expired or is likely to expire in the near future, the same shall be got renewed immediately/ or within time, as the case may be. On



receipt of fresh Bank Guarantee wherever otherwise required, the Registry shall take up steps for returning the documents of renewable/expired Bank Guarantee.”

10. It is not in dispute that in terms of the orders reproduced supra, petitioners have furnished the bank guarantees in favour of the Registrar General of this Court, which are still alive.

11. Petitioners herein claimed to be governed only under the Indian Telegraph Right of Way Rules, 2016 (Referred to as the 2016 Rules) as extended in the year 2018 to the petitioners who fall under category I.P.-I, whereas the State’s action is based on the applicability of 2012 Rules.

12. Significantly, during the pendency of the present Petition, the State Government has now issued a Notification dated 19th August, 2020, notifying the Bihar Mobile Towers, Optical Fibers Cables (OFC) and Related Telecom Infrastructures Rule, 2020 (Referred to as the 2020 Rules) thereby also repealing the 2012 Rules.

13. In this view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioners, while maintaining its stands, submits that if only the petitioners' interest stands protected to the extent of interim orders passed by the Hon’ble Apex Court/this Court, petitioners will take recourse to the mechanism provided under the 2020 Rules or as per law. However, this would be without prejudice to the petitioners' right of agitating all issues before the authority established under the 2020 Rules or as per law. Also, petitioners would keep the bank guarantee alive till such time a proper decision stands taken, per law, by the authority on all the issues, be it regularization of the petitioners’ actions;



payments/dues under all or any one of the Rules referred to supra.

14. Sri Gopal Jain, learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioners' cases are not governed under the 2012 Rules. In fact, they are governed under the 2016 Rules as extended to the petitioners in the year 2018. Hence, the question of payment of any fee under the 2012 Rules does not arise. Also, under the 2020 Rules, there is no dispute resolution mechanism for payment of fee/ charges.

15. Also, at this point, petitioners would not press the relief (a), reserving liberty to agitate the same, if the need so arises subsequently on the very exact cause of action. Further, there is no predicament or bar of this Court in disposing of this Petition, even though the matter on the larger issue is pending before Hon'ble the Apex Court.

16. Sri P.N. Shahi, learned AAG-VI, has no objection to the same, save and except that under all circumstances, the interest of the Revenue is protected, be it by way of keeping the bank guarantees alive or depositing the amount and the issue to be adjudicated by the authority constituted under the 2020 Rules. Also liberty be given to all, for raising all pleas, available to them as per law.

17. Mr. P. N. Shahi, learned AAG-VI, further clarifies that the issue is no longer *res integra* and stands settled by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Ahmedabad Municipal Corporation Versus GTL Infrastructure Limited and others, (2017) 3 SCC 545.**



18. We are inclined to accept the petitioners' prayer and as such dispose of the present Petition on the following terms:-

- (a) Liberty, as prayed for, is granted.
- (b) Petitioners are allowed to take recourse to such measures as are provided under the 2020 Rules.
- (c) This, they must positively do so within the time frame prescribed thereunder or within four weeks from today, whichever is later.
- (d) With the receipt of the application, the authority constituted under the 2020 Rules shall positively decide all issues within a period of three months.
- (e) Bank guarantees shall be kept alive till such time, the petitioners' application stands finalized.
- (f) Prayer (a) reproduced supra stands left open to be agitated subsequently, on the same cause of action, if so required and desired.
- (g) Equally, all issues on merits are left open to be agitated under and in terms of 2020 Rules or other remedies available in law.
- (h) Demand, if at all, to make payment under the 2012 Rules is left open to be considered and adjudicated as per law. However, no demand in terms of notices, Annexure-4 series, shall be enforced until the process under 2020 Rules stands finalized.
- (i) If the petitioners fail to take action within the stipulated time, respondents can encash the bank



guarantees without any further reference to this Court.

- (j) Petitioners' motion shall be without prejudice to their right to challenge the validity of 2020 Rules.
- (k) Liberty is reserved to the petitioners to approach this Court on the same and subsequent cause of action.
19. The Petition stands disposed of in the above terms.”

As prayed for, petition stands disposed of in terms of the judgment dated **29.09.2020** passed in **C.W.J.C. No. 3300 of 2013**, titled as **ATC Telecom Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.**, reproduced supra. The directions issued shall be applicable to the extent possible also to the facts of the instant case.

All applications and petitions stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

pallavi/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	05.10.2020
Transmission Date	

