

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15709 of 2022

=====

M/s Kumar Rice Mill through its Proprietor Dhirendra Kumar Singh, aged about 42 years (male) son of Sri Shankar Dayal Singh, resident of Chhotaka Bahera, Police Station-Amas, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Food and Civil Supply, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Gaya.
3. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sherghati, Gaya.
4. The Block Development Officer, Amas, Gaya.
5. The Circle Officer, Amas, District-Gaya.
6. The Bihar State Food and Supply Corporation Limited through its Managing Director, Patna.
7. The District Manager Bihar State Food Corporation, Gaya.
8. The Assistant Manager Bihar State Food Corporation, Sherghati, Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Jitendra Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAG-5
		Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

3 29-11-2022 Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

- “i. For setting aside the reasoned order passed by District Magistrate, Gaya contained in memo no. 1454 dated 13.5.2022 whereby prayer of the petitioner to unseal the premises of rice mill has been rejected.
- ii. For a direction to the respondent to unseal the premises of M/s Kumar Rice Mill which was sealed on 10.12.2013 in view of the subsequent development whereby issue has been adjudicated by the Hon’ble Sole Arbitrator that nothing is due towards the petitioner’s mill.
- iii. For direction to the respondents to allow the



petitioner to operate the bank account which has been seized by the District Magistrate at the time of sealing of mill premises.

iv. For direction to the respondents to paid damages and compensation to the petitioner for sealing of the rice mill and freezing the bank account without valid reason.

After the matter was heard for some time, finding the Bench not to be in favour of the submission so made across the Bar, learned counsel for the petitioner, under instructions, states that the petitioner shall be content if the petition is disposed of with liberty to take recourse to such other alternate remedies which are equally efficacious in law, including the provisions of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

Prayer allowed.

Petition is disposed with the liberty aforesaid.

Interlocutory application, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Sujit/Ashwini

U			
---	--	--	--

