

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3740 of 2016

=====

Alok Kumar son of Shiv Pujan Pandey Resident of Mohalla- Bank of India,
Colony Raja Bazar, P.s Shastri Nagar, Dist Patna ... Petitioner
Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
 2. The Home Commissioner, Hoem Jail Department Bihar, Patna.
 3. The Director Work Shop, Jail Inspectorate, Home Jail Department Bihar Patna
 4. The Inspector General Jail Bihar, Patna.
 5. The District Magistrate,Cum- Chairman, District Jail Purchase Committee , Patna.
 6. The Additional District Magistrate, Patna.
 7. The Jail Superintendent , Adarsh Central Jail Beur Patna. ... Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr.Nityanand, Adv.
For the Respondents : Mr.Ashok Kumar, SC XI

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY
ORAL ORDER

5 20-06-2023 Heard the parties.

2. The writ petition is filed for the following reliefs :

(i) The order dated 28.08.2012, contained in Memo No. 3866, issued by the Director (Work Shop), Jail Inspectorate, Home (Jail) Department, Bihar Government, Patna, by which the rate of different articles for supply of the same in jail, has been fixed, stating therein that the payment for the supply of grains and other articles, made by the suppliers in jails for financial year 2012-13, till up till now, i.e. from 01.04.2012 to 23.08.2012, shall be made to the suppliers at the rate, fixed and approved for the financial year 2011-12 and the payment for the supply of grains and other articles, made by the



suppliers after the meeting of Central Purchase Committee, i.e. after 23.08.2012, shall be made to the suppliers at the rate, fixed and approved for the financial year 2012-13, which is very lower to market rate and contrary to the rate, fixed by the District Jail Purchase Committee, Patna and approved by the District Magistrate, Patna, as well as contrary to the provision of the rule 1051 of Bihar Jail Manual.

(ii) The order dated 05.10.2012, contained in Memo No. 4527, issued by the Director (Work Shop), Jail Inspectorate, Home (Jail) Department, Bihar Government, Patna, by which the rate fixed by the order dated 28.08.2012, contained in Memo No. 3866, was revised/modified but contrary to the rate fixed by the District Jail Purchase Committee, Patna which is still very lower than that of the market.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed that the matter is presently squarely covered by the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 19583 of 2015 and other writ petitions which were allowed by this Hon'ble Court. Learned counsel has also stated that C.W.J.C. No. 66 of 2013 pertaining to similar reliefs, as claimed in the present writ petition, was allowed by this Hon'ble Court and the said order was confirmed by a Division Bench in LPA No. 594 of 2016 vide order, dated 14.07.2017, and thereafter the said order of the Division Bench was also challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide



Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 28334 of 2017 and the Hon'ble Supreme Court was also pleased to dismiss the Special Leave to Appeal vide order, dated 03.11.2017, therefore, learned counsel has prayed this Hon'ble Court to allow the present writ petition.

4. Moreover, it is stated by the counsel for the petitioner that the order passed by this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 19583 of 2015, dated 05.05.2023, was also complied by the authorities concerned as the full payment was made to the writ petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents while fairly conceding has not disputed the orders passed by this Hon'ble Court in the above referred case but has tried to distinguish the same.

6. A perusal of the order as well as prayer sought in the present writ petition shows that this Hon'ble Court under similar circumstances has allowed the writ petition filed by the petitioner therein. Therefore, the attempt of the counsel for the respondents to distinguish the same on facts is rejected as the above judgment squarely covered to the present case.

7. Admittedly, in the present case also the petitioner was selected for the purpose of supplying of different 16 articles, including the tendered article, i.e., (i) Pulse (Masur), (ii)



Pulse (Gram), (iii) Pulse (Arhar), (iv) Gram, (v) Potato, (vi) Coal, Steam Grade – 2, (vii) Mustard Oil – Dhara and (viii) Milk Powder and the rate which was earlier fixed by the District Jail Purchase Committee was approved by the District Magistrate, Patna, but, after the articles were supplied and the rate fixed by the District Jail Purchase Committee, the Central Purchase Committee has unilaterally reduced the rate fixed. This Court in a catena of cases under similar circumstances has passed the following order :

A bare perusal of the statutory provisions underlying Rule 24 read alongside Rule 1051 of the Jail Manual, would manifest that no appellate jurisdiction is vested in the Central Purchase Committee to preside over the rate recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee. In fact the area is clearly demarcated and whereas the Central Purchase Committee is required to give a wholesome consideration to the requirements and the needs of the Jails established across the State and thus exercises jurisdiction where the purchases are to be made in large quantities, on the other hand, the District Jail Purchase Committees are constituted in each district and are presided by the District Magistrate. These Committees are looking into the individual needs and interests of the jail situated within the district. The area of operation of the two Committee is clearly demarcated and in the



circumstances it is clearly established that the Central Purchase Committee has exceeded its jurisdiction to sit in appeal over the rates so recommended by the respective District Jail Purchase Committee in the present batch of cases.

Another infirmity which is eloquent from a very look of the tender notice is that it is first of its kind where the tenderers are required to make supplies without any agreement on the rates. In fact the tender on record of these batch of writ petitions reflect that the willing tenderers were only applicants for the supplies and the rates for such supplies was to be determined by the District Jail Purchase Committee who had to consider the fixation in the backdrop of the rates prevalent in the markets. Rule 1051 of the Jail Manual manifests that such Committee is to be presided by the District Magistrate and Rule 1051 (v) further provides that the current prices is to be ascertained by the Committee by making enquires.

In a similar manner Rule 24 requires a Central Purchase Committee to take a decision in this regard and Sub Rule (6) thereof vests jurisdiction in the Inspector General to sanction a higher rate then recommended by the Purchase Committee. This singular provision by itself is supportive of the fact that a rate recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee is not to be interfered with in a light manner unless the Inspector General of Prisons is of the opinion to sanction a



higher rate. In the present case it is absolutely the converse and the rates as recommended by the respective District Jail Purchase Committee has been interfered with by the Central Purchase Committee to reduce the same. The period of supply is over and the petitioners have made their supplies under the legitimate expectation of the rates recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee. In my opinion once the District Jail Purchase Committee has approved and recommended the rates offered by the petitioners by following the procedure provided under Rule 1051(v) and it is upon such approval that the supplies were made by the petitioners then the same cannot be reversed unilaterally, midway in the contract and without the consent of the contracting party i.e the petitioners herein. The respondents are estopped from interfering with the rates so recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee in view of the statutory prescriptions as well as on the principles of legitimate expectation and promissory estoppel. In so far as the District of Saharsa and Nawada is concerned, the illegality is further perpetuated when the respondents have gone ahead to recover the differential amount. Apart from the fact that the Central Purchase Committee though presided by the Inspector General of Prisons has no jurisdiction to reverse the rate recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee even otherwise, once the petitioners have made their supplies at a rate



recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee then the rate can not be interfered in the midst of the contract to the prejudice of a contracting party.

The above said judgment has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Division Bench holding as under :

In the matter of purchase made to the jail in question, based on the recommendations of the District Jail Purchase Committee as approved by the Inspector General of Prison, the subsequent action taken by the Central Purchase Committee has been examined by the learned Writ Court in the backdrop of the rules contained under the Jail Manual and it has been found that once the petitioners had supplied the materials based on the recommendations and the price fixed by the District Jail Purchase Committee approved by the Inspector General of Prison, the Central Purchase Committee has no jurisdiction to sit over the matter and reconsider the issue.

After going through the statutory provisions in detail and discussing the issue involved, we find that learned Writ Court has decided the issue in accordance with law, which does not warrant any consideration.

8. Having regard to the above laid legal proposition, the writ petition stands **allowed**. The impugned order is set aside. The Jail Superintendent, Adarsh Central Jail, Beur, Patna,



respondent no. 7, is directed to make payment of the balance differential amount for supply made in the financial year 2012-13 to the petitioner as per the rate recommended by the District Jail Purchase Committee, after adjusting the amount already paid to the petitioner. The Inspector General, Jail, Bihar, Patna, is directed to release the fund for the said purpose. The above exercise shall be complied within eight weeks from the date of receipt/communication of this order.

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

Shamshad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

