

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19948 of 2021

=====

Khangaon PACS having its registered address at Khangaon, P.S. - Khangaon, District - Bhojpur, through its Chairman Satendra Singh, male, aged 65 years, S/o Late Kameshwar Singh, R/o Khangaon, P.S. - Khangaon, District - Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate Bhojpur at Ara.
2. District Magistrate, Bhojpur, Ara.
3. Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation, Patna.
4. District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Bhojpur, Ara.
5. District Coperative Officer, Bhojpur, Ara.
6. Godown Manager, Bazar Samiti Ara, at Bhojpur Ara.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

with
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20542 of 2021

=====

Gopalpur PACS a Society registered under Bihar Co- operative Societies Act, 1935, having its registered address at Village Lodipur, P.S. Chandi, District- Bhojpur, through its Chairman Subhash Chandra Sharma, male, aged 53 years, s/o Durg vijay Sharma, R/o Village Lodipur, P.S. - chandi, Distt- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate Bhojpur, Ara.
2. District Magistrate, Bhojpur, Ara.
3. Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Patna.
4. District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Bhojpur, Ara.
5. District Coperative Officer, Bhojpur, Ara.
6. Godown Manager, Bazar Samiti Ara, Bhojpur Ara.



... .. Respondent/s

with
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 360 of 2022

1. Parasiya PACS having its registered address at Parasiya, P.S.- Jagdishpur, District - Bhojpur, through its Chairman Balmiki Choudhary, male, aged 68 years, S/o Ram Bhushan Choudhary, R/o Diliya, P.S. Jagdishpur, District - Bhojpur.
2. Siaruan PACS, having its registered address at Siaruan, P.S. - Jagdishpur, District Bhojpur, through its Chairman Hareram Singh, male, aged 46 years, S/o Kedar Singh, r/o Siaruan, P.S. Jagdishpur, District - Bhojpur.
3. Pandura PACS having its registered address at Village Pandura Rampur, P.S. Sandesh, District - Bhojpur, through its Chairman Manish Kumar, male, aged 34 years, S/o Ramprasanna Singh, r/o Parura, P.S. Sandesh, District - Bhojpur.
4. Badagaon PACS, having its registered address at Agiaon, P.S. Azimabad, District Bhojpur, through its Chairman Santosh Kumar Singh, male, aged 44 years, S/o Ramayodhya Singh, r/o Bargaon, P.S. Azimabad, District - Bhojpur.
5. Poswan PACS having its registered address at Poswan, P.S. Agiaon, District Bhojpur, through its Chairman Rakesh Kumar Pandey, Male, aged 49 years, s/o Madan Pandey, r/o village Poswan, P.S. Agiaon, District - Bhojpur.
6. Sukhrauli PACS, having its registered address at Piro, P.S. - Piro, District - Bhojpur, through its Chairman Guddu Kumar, male, aged 37 years, S/o Kamla Singh, r/o Village Rasauli, P.S. Piro, District Bhojpur.
7. Jamuwaon PACS having its registered address at P.S. Sandesh, District Bhojpur through its Chairman Devakishor Singh, male, aged 42 years, S/o Lalan Singh, r/o Village Jamuaon, P.S. Sandesh, District - Bhojpur.
8. Kateyan PACS, having its registered address at Kateyan, P.S. Bihiya, District Bhojpur, through its Chairman Bijendra Mishra, male, aged 52 years, S/o Radha Mishra, r/o Village Kateya, P.S. - Bihiya, District - Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through District Magistrate Bhojpur at Ara.
2. The District Magistrate, Bhojpur, Ara.
3. The Food and Consumer Protection Department through the Principal Secretary, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited through its Managing Director, Bihar, Patna.
5. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Patna.



6. The Chief General Manager (Procurement), Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Bihar, Patna.
7. District Manager, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Bhojpur, Ara.
8. District Coperative Officer, Bhojpur, Ara.
9. Godown Manager, Bazar Samiti Ara, at Bhojpur, Ara.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 19948 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harsh Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Manoj Kr. Ambastha (SC26)
For B.S.F.C. Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 20542 of 2021)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harsh Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Syed Iqbal Ahmad (SC 20)
For B.S.F.C. Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 360 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harsh Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad (AAG 5)
For B.S.F.C. Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted by Hon’ble the Chief Justice/Hon’ble Judges through Video Conferencing from their residential offices/residences. Also the Advocates and the Staffs joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing from their residences/offices.)

Date : 12-08-2022

Petitioner in C.W.J.C. No. 19948 of 2021 has prayed
for the following relief(s):

“a. For issuance of a writ in the
nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate
writ, order or direction for quashing the order



dated 20.07.2021 passed by Respondent No. As prayed for, list the matter after three weeks. whereby and whereunder the representation of the Petitioner dated 28.11.2018 for payment of admitted dues for the years 2016 & 2017 of a sum of amounting to Rs.10,17,236 (428.13 quintals CMR @ 2376 per quintals) for supply of 428.13 quintals CMR, filed pursuant to direction of this Hon'ble Court contained in order dated 05.11.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 20924 of 2018 has been rejected without considering any of the contentions of the Petitioner in a completely mechanical manner by passing identical orders in case of different PACS irrespective of the facts and grounds involved in individual cases.

b. For passing a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ order or direction commanding the Respondent for paying the admitted dues of the Petitioner pursuant to the agreement for the year 2016-17, with penal interest in terms of earlier order dated 05.11.2018 passed by this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 20924 of 2018 (Khangaon PACS Vs. State & Ors.).

c. Any other writ or order or direction to which the Petitioner is found by this Hon'ble Court may kindly be issued.”

Petitioner in C.W.J.C. No. 20542 of 2021 has prayed for the following relief(s):



“a) For issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction for quashing the order dated 20.07.2021 passed by Respondent No. 3, whereby and whereunder the representation of the Petitioner dated 28.11.2018 for payment of admitted dues for the years 2016 & 2017 of a sum of Rs.10,29,972.24 (Rupees Ten Lakhs Twenty Nine Thousand Nine Hundred And Seventy Two And Twenty Four Paise Only) with interest filed pursuant to direction of this Hon’ble Court contained in order dated 05.11.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 20982 of 2018 has been rejected without considering any of the contentions of the Petitioner in a completely mechanical manner by passing identical orders in case of different PACS irrespective of the facts and grounds involved in individual cases.

b. For passing a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ order or direction commanding the Respondent for paying the admitted dues of the Petitioner pursuant to the agreement for the year 2016-17, with penal interest in terms of earlier order dated 05.11.2018 passed by this Hon’ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 20982 of 2018 (Gopalpur PACS Vs. State & Ors.).

c. Any other writ or order or direction to which the Petitioner is found by this Hon’ble Court may kindly be issued.”



Petitioners in C.W.J.C. No. 360 of 2022 have prayed
for the following relief(s):

“a. For issuance of a writ in the nature of Certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction for quashing the order dated 27.07.2021 passed by Respondent No. 5, whereby and whereunder the representation of the Petitioners dated 31.07.20218 for payment of admitted dues for the years 2016 & 2017 of the Petitioners, filed pursuant to direction of this Hon’ble Court contained in order dated 07.05.2018 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 7638 of 2018 has been rejected without considering any of the contentions of the Petitioners in a completely mechanical manner by passing identical orders in case of different PACS irrespective of the facts and grounds involved in individual cases.

b. For passing a writ in the nature of Mandamus or any other writ order or direction commanding the Respondent for paying the admitted dues of the Petitioners pursuant to the agreement for the year 2016-17, with penal interest in terms of earlier order dated 07.05.2018 passed by this Hon’ble Court in CWJC No. 7638 of 2018 (Valmiki Choudhary & Ors. Vs. State & Ors.).

c. Any other writ or order or direction to which the Petitioners are found by this Hon’ble Court may kindly be issued.”



Petitioners stand discriminated inasmuch as similarly situated persons' claims were entertained and relief granted.

In view of the same, learned counsel for the petitioners, under instructions, states that petitioners shall be content if a direction is issued to the authority concerned to consider and decide the representation which the petitioners 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 petitioners, 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 on the following terms:-

- (a) Petitioners shall approach the authority concerned
i.e. The Managing Director, Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Patna 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 petitioners;
- (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 petitioners to take recourse to such alternative remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law;

(g) We are hopeful that as and when petitioners take 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 petitioners 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, shall stand disposed of.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

K.C.Jha/DKS

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

