

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14563 of 2017

=====

Rama Nand Singh, aged about 51 years, son of Late Aditya Narayan Singh, Resident of Village- Nadma, Police Station- Barh, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Protection, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Patna.
4. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Patna.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Barh, Patna.
6. The Block Development Officer, Barh, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	None
For the State	:	Mr. U.P. Singh, AC to SC 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 20-03-2023

No one appears for the petitioner.

1. The petitioner by way of this writ petition assails the order passed by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Uday Sinha Judicial Inquiry Commission dated 04.07.2017, whereby it is alleged that the Commission directed him to deposit a sum of Rs. 79,014/-. A look at the order passed by Justice Uday Sinha Judicial Inquiry Commission dated 04.07.2017 reflects that the order passed is as under:-

“ **JUSTICE UDAY SINHA JUDICIAL INQUIRY COMMISSION**

12-13, BLACK HARDINGE ROAD, PATNA-800001

Case no. Pat/Barh/201/16

Ramanand Singh



Vrs

State of Bihar

For the Petitioner : In person
For the Commission : Mr. Binoji Verma, Spl PP
Mr. Arup Chongdar, Spl PP
For the State : Mr. K.K. Mishra, Spl PP

04/07/2017

ORDER

PDS dealer Ramanand Singh is present. Mr. M.A. Rahman, BDO, Barh and Mr. Awadhesh Ram, Director, DRDA, Patna are also present.

There was a demand of Rs. 1,58,028/- against the dealer. He has deposited Rs. 79,014/-. A similar amount remains due from him. Let him deposit the said sum within one month. On his depositing the said sum he will be entitled to handling and transportation charges @ Rs. 50/- per quintal. He will submit his claim before the BDO who will take steps that his claim is paid. The matter is disposed of accordingly.”

2. The aforesaid order, therefore, is not an adjudication but a reiteration of the demand made by the authorities against the petitioner. The petitioner himself approached the Commission which was found for redressal of the grievances of the P.D.S. dealers. As and from the perusal of the aforesaid order, it is apparent that the relief has been granted to the petitioner.

3. In view of above, no writ petition would not be



maintainable against the said order. The writ petition is dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Sachin/-
Item No. 19

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

