

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. OF 2020
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION**

BETWEEN

POSITION OF THE PARTIES

D.P.Dhakad,

PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Union of India Through
Secretary, Ministry of
Agriculture & Farmers'
Welfare, North Block,
Raisina Hills, New Delhi,
Delhi – 110001.

RESPONDENT NO. 1

2. Department of
Agriculture &
Cooperation, Through
Principal Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture
and Farmers Welfare,
Krishi, Bhawan Rajendra
Prasad, Road, New Delhi-
110001

RESPONDENT NO. 2

3. Union of India Through
Principal Secretary,
Ministry of Law &
Justice, 4th Floor, A-
Wing, Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi, Delhi -
110001

RESPONDENT NO. 3

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 32 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF ANY
APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION TO DECLARE
THE PROVISIONS OF FARMERS (EMPOWERMENT AND
PROTECTION) AGREEMENT ON PRICE ASSURANCE AND
FARM SERVICES ACT, 2020 FARMERS PRODUCE TRADE AND
COMMERCE (PROMOTION AND FACILITATION) ACT, 2020
AND RELATED NOTIFICATIONS AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL,
ILLEGAL AND VOID**

TO,
THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA AND
HIS COMPANION JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT
AT NEW DELHI

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE
PETITIONER ABOVE NAMED

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:

1. The present Writ Petition under Article 32 of the Constitution of India has been preferred to challenge the constitutional validity of Farmers Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 and Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020, which liable to be struck down being unconstitutional, illegal and void.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTIES

2. The Petitioner herein is a citizen of India and holds multiple responsibilities at the Panchayat level as well. He is also a member of various agriculture marketing committees at Ratlam in the State of Madhya Pradesh which *interalia* includes Vice President-District Panchayat, Ratlam, Chairman - Education Committee, District Panchayat, Ratlam, Member - District Planning Committee, Ratlam and Director - Agricultural Produce Market, Ratlam.

4

3. The Petitioner herein has the *locus standi* to file the instant Writ Petition being the representative at many levels at the Zila Panchayat as well as in Agriculture marketing committees in Ratlam, Madhya Pradesh. Furthermore he is also Chairman – Yuva Kisan Sangathan, Ratlamand.
4. The Petitioner is well versed with the difficulties being faced by the farmers due to various Governmental policies and in order to highlight the cause of the farmers struggling during the present pandemic has filed the present petition
5. Petitioner herein has no personal interest, or private/oblique motive in filing the instant petition. There is no civil, criminal, revenue or any litigation involving the Petitioner which has or could have a legal nexus with the issues involved in the present Writ Petition.

5

6. The Petitioner herein has not filed any similar Writ Petition either in this Hon'ble Court or any other Court for the reliefs sought in the present Writ Petition.
7. The instant writ petition is based on the information and/or documents which are in public domain.
8. The Respondent No. 1 is the Union of India, represented by the Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers' Welfare, which is the appropriate ministry dealing with the subject of agriculture.
9. The Respondent No. 2 Department of Agriculture & Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Krishi Bhawan Rajendra Prasad Road, New Delhi 110001 A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, Delhi – 110001.
10. The Respondent No.3 Union of India, Through Principal Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice, 4th Floor, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, Delhi – 1100016.

FACTS IN ISSUE

11. It is submitted that on 20.09.2020 despite the largest dissent by the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha *vide* the *viva*

voce vote passed the Famers Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 and Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020. True copy of the Famers Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 is marked and annexed herewith as **ANNEXURE P- 1 (Pages 1 to 37)**. True copy of the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 **ANNEXURE P- 2 (Pages 38 to 45)**

12. It is submitted that the said Acts were passed along with the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020 which has led to weakening and devastating effect on the federalism of Republic of India. True copy of Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 2020 is attached herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE P- 3 (Page 46 to 47)**.
13. It is submitted that the intention of the legislature was that The Farmer's Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 would give the farmers freedom to sell the Agricultural produce

anywhere. However, not realising that this would lead to corporatisation of Agriculture.

14. It is submitted that federalism essentially means both the Centre and States have the freedom to operate in their allotted spheres of power, in coordination with each other. Federalism, like constitutionalism and separation of powers, is not mentioned in the Constitution, however, it is the very essence of our constitutional scheme. The impugned Acts are an attempt to invade into the law making territory of the State Government. On the cursory perusal of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution, It is clear that the Union List and Concurrent List put matters relating to Agriculture outside Parliament's jurisdiction, and give State legislatures exclusive power. No entry in respect of Agriculture in the State List is subject to any entry in the Union or Concurrent Lists. Furthermore, in the Statement of Objects & Reasons, the constitutional provisions under which Parliament has the power to legislate on the subjects covered.

8

15. It is relevant to mention that the Opposition members across different political parties jointly gave a representation to the Hon'ble President of India on 21.09.2020 requesting him to return the Bills without granting his assent there. Despite a strong protest from the opposition members of the House, the impugned Acts were passed in an oblivious manner. Hence, liable to be struck down as unconstitutional, illegal and void. True typed copy of the Representation dated 21.09.2020 is attached herewith and marked as **ANNEXURE P- 4. (Page 48 to 50).**

16. It will be not out of place to mention that the Agriculture Sector employs nearly half of the workforce in the country. In the State of Madhya Pradesh which at the heart of the country with its large area, enjoys diverse climatic and soil conditions suitable for a broad range of agricultural products. Agriculture Sector in Madhya Pradesh forms the backbone of its economy. It contributes almost one-fourth of the Gross State Domestic Product (GSDP) and is the main source of employment for over 65% of the population and constitutes about 60- 75 % of

9

the rural income. In fact, currently, each district in Madhya Pradesh has around 4-5 Mandis approximately totalling to 247 Mandis in the entire State of Madhya Pradesh wherein around 9,000 workers are employed. With the impugned Acts coming into force it has led to many workers losing their livelihood.

17. It is pertinent to mention that the State of Madhya Pradesh has its own statute, The Madhya Pradesh Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 (M.P. Act No. 24 of 1973) that came into force on 18.04.1973 to provide for the better regulation of buying and selling of agricultural produce and the establishment and proper administration of markets of agricultural produce in the State of Madhya Pradesh. True copy of the Madhya Pradesh Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 is marked and annexed herein with as **ANNEXURE P- 5. (Page 51 to 53).**

18. GROUND:

It is most respectfully submitted that the Petitioner prefers the present Writ Leave Petition, *inter alia* on the

following grounds which are taken without prejudice to one another:

- A. BECAUSE the present case requires interference by this Hon'ble Court under Article 32 of the Constitution of India as the provisions of the impugned Acts are against the interest of the farmers of our country.
- B. BECAUSE 'Agriculture' is Entry 14 of List II of the Constitution, over which States have exclusive power to make laws on, by virtue of Article 246(3). Besides, that there are seven entries that contain the terms, relating to agriculture: Entry 18 (rights in or over land, land tenures, rents, transfer agricultural land, agricultural loans, etc.); Entry 28 (markets and fairs); Entry 30 (agricultural indebtedness); Entry 45 (land revenue, land records, etc.); Entry 46 (taxes on agricultural income); Entry 47 (succession of agricultural land); and Entry 48 (estate duty in respect of agricultural land).
- C. BECAUSE there is no mention in the Statement of Objects & Reasons of Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020, and The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 about the constitutional provisions, under which, the

//

Parliament has assumed the power to legislate on the subjects covered in the State List.

D. BECAUSE there are varied agro-climatic zones and cropping patterns, throughout the country, thus, it is important that only the States make laws on the subjects mentioned in List II.

E. BECAUSE the Centre seeks to encroach upon fields, where the States have already enacted legislations to regulate the field of Agriculture, like the Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC) Acts of all the States.

F. BECAUSE The Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 does not establish a market for regulating the purchase and sale of Agricultural produce.

G. BECAUSE the impugned Acts seeks to supplant and encroach upon fields already fully occupied by the provisions of the M.P. Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972. This attempt of the Centre upsets the balance of cooperative federalism which has been recognised as the basic feature of our Constitution.

H. BECAUSE Section 4 of the M.P. Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 provides for an establishment of a market and for every market area a market committee shall be established to regulate the sale and purchase of agricultural produce in that particular market

area, supervise the conduct of market functionaries which is not provided in the Farmers Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020.

- I. BECAUSE as per the provisions of Section 11 of the M.P Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972, the market committee shall consist of chairman who is elected directly by the representatives of agriculturists and traders, representatives of agriculturists, representative of traders which ensures fair representation of both farmers as well and traders. The affairs of the market committee shall be supervised by the managing director appointed under the Act.
- J. BECAUSE the M.P Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 mandates that any person who desires to operate in the market can only operate after obtaining a license from the market committee which can be suspended or cancelled in case of any breach of terms and conditions under Section 33 of the Act.
- K. BECAUSE to protect the interests of the farmers, Section 37 of the M.P Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 prescribes that an agreement shall be executed in favour of the seller and the payment for the agricultural produce shall be paid by the buyer on the same day and incase he defaults to pay the price, he will be liable to make additional payment at the

rate of one percent per day of the total price of the agricultural produce payable to the seller within five days.

L. BECAUSE as per Section 37A of the M.P Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972, a contract farming can only be performed under a written agreement between the producer/farmer and buyer of the produce of the contract farming.

M. BECAUSE The Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020, provides for contract farming, under which farmers will produce crops as per contracts with corporate investors for a mutually agreed remuneration. It is feared that powerful investors would bind them to unfavourable contracts drafted by big corporate law firms, with liability clauses that would be beyond the understanding of poor farmers in most cases.

N. BECAUSE the M.P Krishi Upaj Mandi Adhiniyam, 1972 under Section 40 provides for the constitution of Madhya Pradesh State Agricultural Marketing Board which shall advice the State Government on the fixation of price of agricultural produce, steps to be taken for managing the markets efficiently, supervising agricultural market committee amongst other functions.

- O. BECAUSE Section 4(3) of the Farmers Produce Trade and Commerce(Promotion and facilitation) Act, 2020 prescribes the payment to be made to the seller within a day or three days maximum with no penalty on delay payment or any other deterrent incase of no payment.
- P. BECAUSE there was a hurry on the part of the Centre that it promulgated an ordinance on 5th June, when it couldn't wait for the Monsoon Session of the Parliament to begin. It is relevant to mention the decision of the Hon'ble Court, reported as **(1982) 1 SCC 271, A.K Roy v. Union of India** in the following words: *"The Constituent Assembly therefore conferred upon the executive the power to legislate, not of course intending that the said power should be used recklessly or by imagining a state of affairs to exist when, in fact, it did not exist, nor, indeed, intending that it should be used mala fide in order to prevent the people's elected representatives from passing or rejecting a Bill after a free and open discussion, which is of the essence of democratic process."*
- Q. BECAUSE the object of inserting Entry 33 to List III of Schedule 7 of the Constitution was to enable the Centre to control the production, supply and distribution of the essential commodities throughout the country and the need to transfer Entries 33 and 34 from the Concurrent List to the State List has also

been one of the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission.

R. BECAUSE this Hon'ble Court in its decision reported as **S. R. Bommai v. Union of India**, AIR 1994 SC 1918 the Hon'ble Supreme Court has essentially held that both the States and the Centre equally enjoy the exercise of their sovereign power conferred upon them by the Constitution. The relevant excerpt of the judgment is reproduced here as under:

"14. The fact that under the scheme of our Constitution, greater power is conferred upon the Centre vis-a-vis the States does not mean that States are mere appendages of the Centre. With the sphere allotted to them, States are supreme. The Centre cannot tamper with their powers. More particularly, the Courts should not adopt an approach, an interpretation, which has the effect of or tends to have the effect of whittling down the powers reserved to the States..."

S. BECAUSE in the decision reported as **ITC Ltd v Agricultural Produce Market Committee & Ors.** (2002) 9 SCC 232, the Supreme Court upheld the validity of several state laws relating to agricultural produce marketing, and struck down the central Tobacco Board Act, 1975. It interpreted Entry 28 of the State List (markets and fairs) in favour of states, and rejected the Centre's argument based on Entry

52 of the Union List read with Entry 33 of Concurrent List that tobacco is an industry declared as being under the control of Parliament in public interest. It said raw materials or activity that does not involve manufacture or production cannot be covered under 'industry'.

T. BECAUSE this Hon'ble Court in the decision reported as **State of Rajasthan v G Chawla AIR 1959 SC 544**, has used the doctrine of "pith and substance" to determine the character of legislation that overlaps between entries. The constitutionality of legislation is upheld if it is largely covered by one list and touches upon the other list only incidentally. But the two new farm Acts transgress the same as they directly impinge upon entries in the State List.

U. BECAUSE this Hon'ble Court in its decision reported as **(1971) 2 SCC 779 Union of India vs. Shri Harbhajan Singh Dhillon** specifically laid down the test for weighing constitutionality of a law made by the Parliament. The relevant excerpt of the judgment reads as under:

"67. ... If a Central Act is challenged as being beyond the legislative competence of Parliament, it is enough to enquire if it is a law with respect to matters or taxes enumerated in List II. If it is not, no further question arises."

V. BECAUSE the impugned Acts are violative of the right against exploitation enshrined in the Constitution under Article 23 for its failure to protect the poor, unorganized, marginal and small farmers.

W. BECAUSE the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 provides for contract farming, under which farmers will produce crops as per the contracts entered into with the corporate investors for a mutually agreed remuneration. However, considering the literacy level of the vulnerable farmers in the country, there will always be a possibility that powerful investors would bind them to unfavourable contracts with strict liability clauses that would be beyond the understanding of poor farmers.

X. BECAUSE Section 2(e) of the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 limits the definition of the expression “farmer” to the extent that goes on to exclude labour/tillers/share cropper, working in the farm from the definition.

Y. BECAUSE the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 provides for contract farming, under which farmers will produce crops as per the contracts entered into with the corporate investors for

a mutually agreed remuneration. However, considering the literacy level of the vulnerable farmers in the country, there will always be a possibility that powerful investors would bind them to unfavourable contracts with strict liability clauses that would be beyond the understanding of poor farmers.

Z. BECAUSE the use of expression 'predetermined quality' under Section 2(g) of the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 which essentially defines "Farming Agreement" may prove to be detrimental to the interest of the Farmers as it is not only unreasonable but also opens window for corporations to refuse the yield or re-negotiate the prices.

AA.BECAUSE Section 18 of the Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 expressly bars any suit, prosecution or other legal proceedings against the Central & State Government, Registration Authority, Sub-Divisional Authority & Appellate Authority acting in good faith under the Act or rules made pursuant to it, thereby, providing them an immunity as well as license to act in arbitrary manner without any accountability whatsoever.

BB. BECAUSE as per Section 6 of the Farmers' Produce Trade And Commerce (Promotion And Facilitation) Act, 2020, "*No market fee or cess or levy, by whatever name called, under any State APMC Act or any other State law, shall be levied on any farmer or trader or electronic trading and transaction platform for trade and commerce in scheduled farmers' produce in a trade area.*" In light of the above, it becomes important to mention that, as per section 2 (m) of the Act, "trade area" means any area or location, place of production, collection and aggregation including—

- (a) farm gates;
- (b) factory premises;
- (c) warehouses;
- (d) silos;
- (e) cold storages; or
- (f) any other structures or places,

from where trade of farmers' produce may be undertaken in the territory of India **but does not include** the premises, enclosures and structures constituting—

- (i) physical boundaries of principal market yards, sub-market yards and market sub-yards managed

and run by the market committees formed under each State APMC Act in force in India; and

(ii) private market yards, private market sub-yards, direct marketing collection centres, and private farmer-consumer market yards managed by persons holding licenses or any warehouses, silos, cold storages or other structures notified as markets or deemed markets under each State APMC Act in force in India;

Such distinction is not only arbitrary and unreasonable and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, but it also affects the taxing power of the State.

CC. BECAUSE the Centre has, essentially, tried to usurp the taxing power of the States, by creating a differentiation of the categories of the trade areas, that shall be taxed and the ones that shall not be taxed, which is the private market yards. However, there is no justification that has been provided, either in the Act or in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, so as to what is the intelligible differentia for rendering such a classification of the trade area, thus it is hit by Article 14 of the Constitution and is thus manifestly arbitrary.

DD. BECAUSE a legislative provision that is manifestly arbitrary contravenes Article 14. As per the

Constitution Bench in *Shayara Bano v. Union of India*, (2017) 9 SCC 1, a legislature is manifestly arbitrary when “it is not fair, not reasonable, discriminatory, not transparent, capricious, biased, with favouritism or nepotism and not in pursuit of promotion of healthy competition and equitable treatment”. Equally, in order to not be manifestly arbitrary, the legislation should “conform to norms which are rational, informed with reason and guided by public interest, etc.” (Nariman, J.’s opinion at para 95).

EE. BECAUSE to be valid under Article 14, any given classification must pass the “reasonable classification” test, for which it must exhibit (i) an intelligible differentia, i.e. a clear basis of differentiation between the two classes, and (ii) a rational nexus between the classification and the object sought to be achieved by the Act. Further, (iii) the object of the legislation must also not be discriminatory. The impugned provision fails on all three counts.

FF. BECAUSE there is an absence of any justifiable reasoning and clear legislative intent towards the above mentioned classification and it creates an artificial discrimination based on an impermissible and invalid classification and the Hon’ble Supreme Court has dealt with the dimension of Article 14 in its

application to legislation and rendering of legislation invalid in Subramanian Swamy Vs. Director, Central Bureau of Investigation and Another, reported in (2014) 8 SCC 682, Paragraph-49 of the said judgment reads as under:

“Court’s approach

49. Where there is challenge to the constitutional validity of a law enacted by the legislature, the Court must keep in view that there is always a presumption of constitutionality of an enactment, and a clear transgression of constitutional principles must be shown. The fundamental nature and importance of the legislative process needs to be recognized by the Court and due regard and deference must be accorded to the legislative process. Where the legislation is sought to be challenged as being unconstitutional and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution, the Court must remind itself to the principles relating to the applicability of Article 14 in relation to invalidation of legislation. The two dimensions of Article 14 in its application to legislation and rendering legislation invalid are now well recognized and these are (i) discrimination, based

on an impermissible or invalid classification and (ii) excessive delegation of powers; conferment of uncanalised and unguided powers on the executive, whether in the form of delegated legislation or by way of conferment of authority to pass administrative orders – if such conferment is without any guidance, control or checks, it is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution”

(emphasis supplied)

GG. BECAUSE the contentious bills were passed by a voice vote. However, as per the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, if the result of a voice vote is called into question by a member, the Rajya Sabha should go for a division. While, it is true that order in the House is required for a division, it is equally true that order in the House is also required for a voice vote. If there was disorder in the House, it would not have been possible for the Deputy Chairman to ascertain which side was louder.

HH. BECAUSE the way in which all constitutional as well as parliamentary mandates and limits were crossed and rules, regulations and procedure were given a go-by, casts aspersions on the very manner in which the aforesaid bills were crystallised into law on the floor

of the Upper House. Moreover, the said bills were passed without taking up the five resolutions moved by the opposition MPs and two separate motions demanding the reference to a Select or Standing Committee of Parliament. Furthermore, there was lack of any proper and meaningful representation/consultation and opinions were not taken from the stake holders before passing these bills.

II. BECAUSE the opposing MPs were concerned with something which affects the very backbone of the Indian Republic viz its *annadata*, the community of farmers. On an issue like this, a model of majoritarian, insensitive and uncaring governance was incorporated.

JJ.BECAUSE the MPs were in full show, with full force in government instructions to all, given the brazen object of ramming legislation down the throat of disagreeing Parliamentarians without allowing it to be tested freely and fairly by vote by division.

KK. BECAUSE the Bills were purportedly treated as passed which were never voted upon. Division asked, not by one, but innumerable Members was denied. Motions and statutory resolutions, including for amendments, were not even looked at, much less considered. No attempt was made to even try for a sense of the House or a consensus as to whether the

House should sit beyond the strictly prescribed 1 pm or continue the next day. September 20, most inexplicably and mysteriously, was treated as if it was the last day of the session and as if something grave would happen, if voting with division was held on 21/9/201 Massive show of force was exerted by security personnel invited inside the House in numbers exceeding those of the MPs present. Almost half the Rajya Sabha was seated in the Lok Sabha chamber and the Chair neither looked towards that Chamber, nor asked them, nor allowed them to participate in any manner nor involved them large parts of the proceedings in the Rajya Sabha chamber were not even audible to those of the Rajya Sabha in the Lok Sabha Chamber. Quorum for Rajya Sabha proceedings could not therefore be said to exist.

LL.BECAUSE the passing of the impugned acts is against the parliamentary convention of referring Bills to the department-related parliamentary standing committees for scrutiny and examination and strikes at the root of deliberative and consultative process. Furthermore, in the absence of such in-depth deliberation free from party perspectives, the impugned Acts suffer from a deficit of legislative scrutiny.

MM.BECAUSE the hasty manner in which the impugned Acts have been passed particularly in the Upper

House of the parliament goes on to show that the Government has scant regard for the well-established parliamentary procedures. Therefore, such a procedural lapse not only goes to the root of the challenge but is also a subversion of democratic principles.

19. The Petitioner herein states that he has no other alternative, equally efficacious remedy except to approach this Hon'ble Court by means of the present petition.
20. The Petitioner has for the first time filed this Petition in respect of the subject-matter, i.e., quashing of The Farmers' (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement of Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 and Farmers' Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion And Facilitation) Act, 2020.
21. The Petitioner herein submits that this Hon'ble Court has the requisite jurisdiction to entertain the present Writ Petition and adjudicate upon the issues arising there from.
22. It is humbly submitted the present issue is a fit case to be entertained as public interest litigation as the persons directly affected by the operation of the impugned provisions of the Act are unlikely to directly approach this Hon'ble Court for due to the on-going pandemic situation amongst other reasons.

23. The Petitioner seeks leave of this Hon'ble Court to raise any other ground during the time of the hearing.

PRAYER

It is therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble court may be pleased to:

- a) To issue any suitable Writ, Order or Direction declaring Farmers Produce Trade and Commerce (Promotion and Facilitation) Act, 2020 as being unconstitutional, illegal and void, and/ or;
- b) To issue any suitable Writ, Order or Direction declaring Farmers (Empowerment and Protection) Agreement on Price Assurance and Farm Services Act, 2020 as being unconstitutional, illegal and void, and/ or;
- c) Pass such further and other order(s) may be deemed just, fit and proper in the facts & circumstances of this case.

AND FOR THIS ACT OF KINDNESS, THE PETITIONER AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY.

DRAWN ON:
FILED ON:

DRAWN & FILED BY:

(SUMEER SODHI)
ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER