

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1046 of 2022

=====

M/S Amrapali Packaging Pvt. Limited A Company registered under Indian Companies Act, 1956 - having its registered Office at C- 12 (P) Industrial Area, Hajipur (Vaishali) through its Director Prithvi Nath Prasad, Male, Aged about 58 Years, Son of Harihar Prasad, Resident of A/230, P.C. Colony, Kankarbagh, Patna, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner, Commercial Taxes Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Industries Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prince Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Vikash Kumar (SC-11)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 07-03-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s).

“a) For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to reimburse the petitioner Company subsidy under the heading of Value Added Tax (for brevity referred as “VAT”)/Goods and Service Tax 2017 (for brevity referred as “GST”)/Central Service Tax (for brevity “CST”)/Bihar Tax on Entry of Goods into Local Areas for Consumption, Use or Sale Therein Act, 1993 (for brevity referred as “Bihar Entry Tax Act”)

in terms of Clause 3(i) of the Industrial Incentive Policy 2011 (hereinafter referred as “Industrial Policy”), for the period of 01.04.2016 to 30.06.2017.

b) For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to release Capital Subsidy to the Petitioner Company in terms of Clause 2(vii) of the Industrial Incentive Policy-2011 to the petitioner-as recommendation for same has been already made in favour of petitioner.

c) For issuance of order/orders, direction/directions or writ/writs in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to grant Exemption for Monthly Minimum Charges/Minimum Base Energy Charge & reimbursement of Electricity Duty & Capital Subsidy in terms of Clause 2 (v) (vi) & (vii) of the Industrial Incentive Policy-2011, to the Petitioner Company after January 2016- as same has been stopped without disclosing any reasons.

d) For holding that the inordinate delay in reimbursement of VAT/GST/CST/ Entry Tax in terms of the Bihar Industrial Incentive Policy, 2011 to the petitioner company even after making the entire investment as well as grant of approval of State Investment Promotion Board [for brevity “SIPB], Bihar, Patna is unjust, illegal and arbitrary.

e) For holding that the inordinate delay in Exemption for Monthly Minimum

Charges/Minimum Base
Energy Charge & Clause 2(v) (vi) & (vii) of
Bihar Industrial Incentive Policy-2011, even
after making the entire investment as well as
grant of approval of SIPB, Bihar, Patna is
unjust, illegal and arbitrary,
f) For any other relief to which the Petitioner
may be entitled.”

After the matter was heard for some time, finding the
Bench not to be agreeable with the submissions made by learned
counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner,
under instructions, states that petitioner shall be content if a
direction is issued to the authority concerned i.e. **(Respondent
No. 3, the Director Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna)**
to consider and decide the representation which the petitioner
shall be filing within a period of four weeks from today for
redressal of the grievance(s).

Learned counsel for the respondents states that if
such a representation is filed by the petitioner, the authority
concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously and
preferably within a period of four months from the date of its
filing along with a copy of this order.

Statement accepted and taken on record.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***D. N. Jeevaraj Vs.***

Chief Secretary, Government of Karnataka & Ors, (2016) 2

SCC 653, paragraphs 34 to 38 observed as under:-

“34. The learned counsel for the parties addressed us on the question of the bona fides of Nagalaxmi Bai in filing a public interest litigation. We leave this question open and do not express any opinion on the correctness or otherwise of the decision of the High Court in this regard.

35. However, we note that generally speaking, procedural technicalities ought to take a back seat in public interest litigation. This Court held in *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.* [*Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra v. State of U.P.*, 1989 Supp (1) SCC 504] to this effect as follows: (SCC p. 515, para 16)

“16. The writ petitions before us are not inter parties disputes and have been raised by way of public interest litigation and the controversy before the court is as to whether for social safety and for creating a hazardless environment for the people to live in, mining in the area should be permitted or stopped. We may not be taken to have said that for public interest litigations, procedural laws do not apply. At the same time it has to be remembered that every technicality in the procedural law is not available as a defence when a matter of grave public importance is for consideration before the court.”

36. A considerable amount has been said about public interest litigation in *R&M Trust [R&M Trust v. Koramangala Residents Vigilance Group, (2005) 3 SCC 91]* and it is not necessary for us to dwell any further on this except to say that in issues pertaining to good governance, the courts ought to be somewhat more liberal in entertaining public interest litigation. However, in matters that may not be of moment or a litigation essentially directed against one organisation or individual (such as the present litigation which was directed only against Sadananda Gowda and later Jeevaraj was impleaded) ought not to be entertained or should be rarely entertained. Other

remedies are also available to public spirited litigants and they should be encouraged to avail of such remedies.

37. In such cases, that might not strictly fall in the category of public interest litigation and for which other remedies are available, insofar as the issuance of a writ of mandamus is concerned, this Court held in *Union of India v. S.B. Vohra* [*Union of India v. S.B. Vohra*, (2004) 2 SCC 150: 2004 SCC (L&S) 363] that: (SCC p. 160, paras 12-13)

“12. Mandamus literally means a command. The essence of mandamus in England was that it was a royal command issued by the King's Bench (now Queen's Bench) directing performance of a public legal duty.

13. A writ of mandamus is issued in favour of a person who establishes a legal right in himself. A writ of mandamus is issued against a person who has a legal duty to perform but has failed and/or neglected to do so. Such a legal duty emanates from either in discharge of a public duty or by operation of law. The writ of mandamus is of a most extensive remedial nature. The object of mandamus is to prevent disorder from a failure of justice and is required to be granted in all cases where law has established no specific remedy and whether justice despite demanded has not been granted.”

38. A salutary principle or a well-recognised rule that needs to be kept in mind before issuing a writ of mandamus was stated in *Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India* [*Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. v. Union of India*, (1974) 2 SCC 630] in the following words: (SCC pp. 641-42, paras 24-25)

“24. ... The powers of the High Court under Article 226 are not strictly confined to the limits to which proceedings for prerogative writs are subject in English practice. Nevertheless, the well-recognised rule that no writ or order in the nature of a mandamus would issue when there is no failure to perform a mandatory duty applies in this country as well. Even in cases of alleged breaches of mandatory duties, the

salutary general rule, which is subject to certain exceptions, applied by us, as it is in England, when a writ of mandamus is asked for, could be stated as we find it set out in *Halsbury's Laws of England* (3rd Edn.), Vol. 11, p. 106:

‘198. *Demand for performance must precede application.*—As a general rule the order will not be granted unless the party complained of has known what it was he was required to do, so that he had the means of considering whether or not he should comply, and it must be shown by evidence that there was a distinct demand of that which the party seeking the mandamus desires to enforce, and that that demand was met by a refusal.’

25. In the cases before us there was no such demand or refusal. Thus, no ground whatsoever is shown here for the issue of any writ, order, or direction under Article 226 of the Constitution.”

As such, petition stands disposed of in the following

terms:-

(a) Petitioner shall approach the authority concerned within a period of four weeks from today by filing a representation for redressal of the grievance(s);

b) The authority concerned shall consider and dispose it of expeditiously by a reasoned and speaking order preferably within a period of four months from the date of its filing along with a copy of this order;

(c) The order assigning reasons shall be communicated to the petitioner;

(d) Needless to add, while considering such representation, principles of natural justice shall be followed and due opportunity of hearing afforded to the parties;

(e) Also, opportunity to place on record all relevant materials/documents shall be granted to the parties;

(f) Equally, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;

(g) We are hopeful that as and when petitioner takes recourse to such remedies, as are otherwise available in law, before the appropriate forum, the same shall be dealt with, in accordance with law and with reasonable dispatch;

(h) Liberty reserved to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum/Court, should the need so arise subsequently on the same and subsequent cause of action;

(i) We have not expressed any opinion on merits. All issues are left open;

(j) The proceedings, during the time of

current Pandemic- Covid-19 shall be conducted through digital mode, unless the parties otherwise mutually agree to meet in person i.e. physical mode;

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

Interlocutory Application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

veena/rajiv-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	