

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.23147 of 2018

=====

Anish Kumar S/o Late Lalan Singh R/o Village- Sahvajpur Dhabai, P.O.-
Injore, P.S.- Mehadia, District- Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary, Animal Husbandary and Fishries Deptt, Govt of Bihar, Patna
3. The Director of the Animal and Fishries Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Patna
4. The Director, Dairy Development Directorate, Bihar, Patna
5. The District Magistrate, Arwal
6. The District Animal Husbandary Officer, Arwal
7. The District Dairy Development officer, Arwal
8. The Punjab National Bank, through its Branch Manager, Branch - Arwal
9. The Branch Manager,Punjab National Bank, Branch - Arwal, Dist- Arwal

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Kumar Praveen, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar, Advocate
For the PNB	:	Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 27-02-2023 Heard Mr. Kumar Praveen, learned Counsel

 appearing on behalf of the petitioner; Mr. Dhurjati Kumar,

 learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State and Mr.

 Mritunjay Kumar, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of

 PNB.

 2. Mr. Kumar Pravin, learned counsel appearing

 on behalf of the petitioner, informed this Court that

 petitioner has already entered into one time settlement of



his loan account with the Punjab National Bank, Arwal Branch and in that view of the matter, the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present writ petition with the liberty to raise all his grievances before the Respondent No.2- the Principal Secretary Animal Husbandary & Fishries Department, Government of Bihar.

3. He further submitted that the petitioner has been duped on false assurances by the veterinary doctor and the concerned Bank Manager, who were posted at the relevant point of time, the Insurance Company and has also questioned the role of Respondent No. 6- District Animal Husbandary Officer, Arwal. The petitioner has now been deprived of his livelihood on such false assurances made by the concerned Officers.

4. In view of the fact that the petitioner has now been vexed to settle the account after it having been turned NPA and has agreed to one time settlement, the petitioner is directed to file representation before the Respondent No.2, the Principal Secretary Animal Husbandary & Fishries Department, Government of Bihar.



5. This Court finds that the State has been put to great monetary loss and public at large has to suffer because of non-implementation of the policy and the petitioner has been put to suffer. No development has taken place and the amount of subsidy is drained out without establishment of any functional unit as in the present case. It seems that authorities are incapacitated to perform the duty in due diligence leading to impend the growth of the agro-industrialization in the State of Bihar.

6. Considering the peculiar facts of the case, the Respondent No.2, the Principal Secretary Animal Husbandry & Fisheries Department, Government of Bihar, is directed to summon the concerned Branch Manager of Punjab National Bank, the veterinary doctor, who was posted at the relevant point of time and the District Animal Husbandry Officer, Arwal who possesses all the records of the period, and were involved in disbursement of loan amount of Rs. 50,00,000/- for establishment of dairy farm namely, Radha Krishna Dairy Farm, owned and same was inaugurated on 06.06.2015 by the then



District Magistrate, Arwal as stated in paragraph No.7 of the present writ petition.

7. The Respondent No.2, the Principal Secretary Animal Husbandary & Fishries Deparment, Government of Bihar, is required to take the matter seriously and take disciplinary action if required against all the authorities considering the records of the case maintained at the office of District/Block Animal Husbandary Officer or the Branch Manager, who was responsible at the relevant point of time when the proposal of the dairy farm project was approved and the same was inaugurated on 06.06.2021.

8. The petitioner is directed to file detailed representation in support of claim before the Respondent No.2, who is required to dispose of the representation within a period of six weeks from the date of representation after affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The petitioner must be communicated the action taken against the erring officials by the Respondent No.2, who have failed in their duty leading to



industrialization in the State.

9. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Niraj/-
Nilmani/-

U			
---	--	--	--

