

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.831 of 2017

=====

Shiv Narayan Kumar, Son of Late Jiwachh Yadav, Resident of Village - Gamauli,
Post - Marthua, P.S. - Bithan, District - Samastipur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Samastipur, District- Samastipur.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Rosara, District - Samastipur.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajeev Kumar Labh, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to GA 6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 14-12-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel
for the respondents.

2. The writ petition has been filed *for* quashing the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Rosara vide Memo No. 404 dated 30.11.2016 whereby and whereunder licence of the petitioner's P.D.S. Shop bearing no. 105/2007 old and 440/16 new has been suspended contained in Annexure-3 and quashing the order passed by the same authority vide Memo No. 450 dated 23.12.2016 whereby and whereunder licence of the petitioner's P.D.S. shop bearing No. 440/16 has been cancelled contained in Annexure-1 and further to restore the petitioner's licence as before and to make allotment for the same.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner makes a short



submission to assail the impugned order on the ground that a copy of the enquiry report was not made available to the petitioner and he was never confronted with the same with an opportunity of being heard or adducing evidence in that regard. A specific stand has been taken in paragraph 17 of the writ petition that the impugned order of cancellation of licence has been passed without providing a copy of the enquiry report to the petitioner, though the same had been relied upon in the impugned order.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard. The stand of the petitioner with regard to non-supply of enquiry report has not been controverted, as no counter affidavit has been filed till date.

5. In the above view of the matter, this Court is satisfied that non-supply of the enquiry report to the petitioner has resulted in violation of natural justice and thus the decision making process stands vitiated. The impugned order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Rosara, Samastipur vide Memo No. 450 dated 23.12.2016 (Annexure-1) is hereby quashed and the matter remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Rosara, Samastipur for taking decision afresh in the matter after supplying a copy of the enquiry report to the petitioner and granting an opportunity of hearing in accordance with law. Supplies to the petitioner shall be restored without delay until fresh orders are passed by the respondent no. 3.



6. It is made clear that in case the stand of the petitioner denying receipt of the enquiry report prior to order of cancellation being passed is found to be incorrect, the respondents shall be at liberty to approach this Court for recall of this judgment.

7. The writ petition stands allowed as above.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	19.12.2017
Transmission Date	N.A.

