

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11327 of 2017

=====

Rampukar Singh son of Santan Singh Proprietor of M/s R.M. Rice Mill,
resident of Village- Gopalpur, P.S.- Sherghati, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Food And Consumer Protection Department Through Its Principal Secretary, Bihar at Patna
2. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, District- Gaya.
3. The Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd. through its Managing Director, Bihar at Patna
4. The Chief of Finance, Head Quarter, the Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd, Patna.
5. The District Manager, The Bihar State Food and Civil Supplies Corporation Ltd, District- Gaya.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sumeet Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Arvind Ujjwal- Sc4
	:	Mr. Shailendra Kr. Singh, Advocate
	:	Mr. Utkarsha Utpal, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 25-07-2025

1. The Writ petition is filed for following
reliefs:-

*I. That the present writ application
has been filed for the issuance of
the appropriate writ order(s) or
direction(s) in the nature of
Mandamus for commanding the
respondent authorities to consider
the genuine bill of the petitioner
with respect to the transportation,*



milling and handling charges for the procurement year 2013-14 and 2014-15 entered between the B.S.F.C, Gaya and the petitioner of Rs.44,55,898.98/- with 12% interest ;

II. That the present writ application has been filed for the issuance of the appropriate writ order(s) or direction(s) in the nature of Mandamus for a direction to the M.D., B.S.F.C, Patna and the Chief of Finance, B.S.F.C to consider the representation given by the petitioner for the transportation, milling and handling charge for the procurement year of Rs.44,55,898.98/- and further to clear the dues with 12% interest from the date of dues.

III. And for the issuance of any other relief or relief(s) for which the petitioner is entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

3. During the course of arguments, the Learned counsel for the petitioner reported that he



has made a representation dated 12.07.2017 (Annexure-6), but the same was not considered by the respondent authorities and therefore, the Writ petition is filed.

4. On the other hand, the Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that there is no endorsement on the said representation indicating that it was received by the respondent authorities. It is also contended by the Learned counsel for the respondent that a fresh representation may be filed by the petitioner to enable the respondents to pass appropriate orders basing on the said representation.

5. Taking into consideration, the representation dated 12.07.2017 is not found to be within the domain of the respondents, therefore, this Court directs the petitioner to file a fresh representation within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. In turn, the respondent authority shall also pass appropriate orders considering the merits of the case within two months from the date of receipt of this order.



6. With the aforesaid observations, the Writ
petition is disposed of.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

amitkr/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	31.07.2025
Transmission Date	N/A

