

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2704 of 2018

=====

Niranjan Gai @ Niranjan Kumar @ Niranjan Kr. Gai son of late Rati Kant Gai resident of village Amarpur, Ward no. 6, P.O. and P.S. Amarpur, District Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The District Magistrate, Banka.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Banka.
4. The District Supply Officer, Banka.
5. The District Manager, State Food Corporation, Banka.
6. The Block Co-operative Extension Officer Cum In-Charge Authority Paddy Purchase, Amarpur, cum Secret
7. The Certificate Officer, Banka.
8. The Registrar, Co-operative, Bihar, Patna.
9. The District Co-operative Officer, Banka.
10. The Vyapar Mandal Amarpur Banka through its Secretary Near State Bank of India Amarpur Banka.
11. The Secretary Vyapar Mandal Amarpur Banka through Near State Bank of India Amarpur Banka.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the BSFC	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, Adv.
		Mr. Utkarsha Utpal, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.U.S.S.Singh -Gp19

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 17-07-2025

1. The petitioner has filed the Writ petition
for the following reliefs:_

*(i) For issuance of an
appropriate writ in the nature of*



Mandamus, commanding the Respondent Authorities to give effect to the order dated 28.1.2017 passed by the Certificate Officer in Certificate case no. 09/2013-14 Banka.

(ii) For direction upon the Respondent Authorities to take all effective steps to give effect/to implement aforesaid order so that the amount payable by Vyapar Mandal should be paid to the Respondent Authorities.

(iii) For declaration that the petitioner is not the proprietor of the Vayapar Mandal Amarpur Banka or in alternative the petitioner may be declared as Proprietor of the Vyapar Mandal Amarpur Banka.

(iv) Any other order or orders as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case be granted to the petitioner.

2. During the course of arguments, it is contended by the Learned counsel for the respondents that the order of the Certificate Officer dated 28.01.2017 in Certificate Case No. 09/2013-14 was already given effect to, and subsequently,



another order was passed by the Certificate Officer, also fixing the liability of the petitioner.

3. However, this Court would not go into the contents of that subsequent order, as the limited prayer made by the Writ petitioner is only for giving effect to the order dated 28.01.2017 itself. If at all the petitioner is aggrieved by the subsequent order, he is always at liberty to challenge the same.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the Writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

AMANDEEP/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	18.7.2025
Transmission Date	

