

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1898 of 2016

Janardan Ram Son of Kamleshwari Ram, Resident of Village - Singarpur, P.S.
Uda - Kishunganj, District - Madhepura.

.... Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Madhepura.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer Udakishunganj, Madhepura.
4. The District Supply Officer Madhepura.
5. The Block Development Officer, Puraini District - Madhepura.

.... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Mishra,
Mr. Piyush Saurav, Advocates
For the State : Mr. Chhotelal Mishra, A.C. to G.A. 13

CORAM: HONOURABLE DR. JUSTICE RAVI RANJAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 02-02-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

Grievance of the petitioner is that the Sub-Divisional Officer vide order dated 04.12.2015 (Annexure 1) has cancelled the licence of the petitioner on the ground that Udakishunganj P.S. Case No.195/2015 has been lodged against the petitioner under the various provisions including Section 7 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955.

It is contended that this issue is no longer *res integra* as this Court has held on several occasions that PDS licence cannot be cancelled in the aforesaid manner.

I find force in the submission raised on behalf of the



petitioner. There are only two provisions for cancellation of licence under the Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2001. One is under Clause 7(ii) which lays down in clear terms that if the licensee contravenes any provision or any terms and conditions of license then apart from taking action against him under the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, his license can be cancelled by the Licensing Authority but not before granting him reasonable opportunity for stating his case against the proposed cancellation. The second provision is under Clause 14 which is consequential to the confiscation of the licensee under the provision of Essential Commodities Act. It provides that once a licensee has been convicted as above, the Licensing Authority by recording order in writing would cancel his licence. Except this there is no other provision and there is no provision that the moment first information report is lodged under any section of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 the licence is necessarily or automatically has to be cancelled.

Accordingly, in my view, the impugned order, as contained in Annexure 1, cannot be sustained and the same is quashed and set aside.

As a consequence of the setting aside of the order as contained in Annexure 1, the supplies to the petitioner should be restored.

However, it is made clear that this order would not come in the way of the authorities if they decide to issue a fresh show cause notice against the petitioner for any violation of the terms and conditions or provisions under Clause 7(ii) of the Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2001 but in such case, procedure laid down under the Control Order has to be followed.

Accordingly, this writ application stands allowed.

(Dr. Ravi Ranjan, J)

Sanjay-II/-

U			
---	--	--	--