
(2006) 06 PAT CK 0041
In the Patna High Court
Case No : CWJC No. 6771 of 2006

Sashi Arts Promotion Charitable Trust	APPELLANT
Vs	
The State of Bihar and Others	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 08-06-2006

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 14

Citation : (2006) 3 PLJR 194

Hon'ble Judges : V.N. Sinha, J

Bench : Single Bench

Judgement

V.N. Sinha, J.—Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the counsel appearing for the State. Petitioner was earlier allotted the grounds of Moin-Ul-Haque Stadium for organizing cultural programme vide order dated 19.5.2006 (Annexure-4). In compliance of the allotment order, the petitioner deposited the amount of rent and security deposit and then took steps for organising the cultural programme and paid advance to the artists and took steps for printing of tickets as also for sitting arrangement of the audience.

2. Under the impugned order dated 2.6.2006 (Annexure 6), the allotment made under Annexure 4 has been cancelled. Petitioner having received the cancellation order, filed representation dated 5.6.2006 which is pending till date.

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that having received the allotment order, he made substantial investment for organising the programme and without hearing him, the cancellation has been made under impugned order dated 2.6.2006 which is wholly arbitrary and contrary to Article 14 of Constitution of India. Counsel for the State disputes the submission and has prayed for time to file counter-affidavit, instead of granting time to file counter-affidavit, I deem it expedient to dispose of the writ application. The Director General, Bihar State Sport Authority, Govt. of Bihar, Patna is directed to consider and dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 8.6.2006 at an early date. If there is no legal bar in permitting the petitioner to hold the show he should be allowed to

hold the show as others in the past have been allowed to hold the show in the grounds of the stadium and for that purpose, the authority should even consider the desirability to extend the permission already granted to the petitioner.