

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11873 of 2016**

=====

Prabhash Prasad Singh, Son of Late Tinkauri Prasad Singh, Resident of Village - Mahgama, P.O.- Harna, Bujurg, P.S.-Rajaun, District- Banka.

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

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

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajeev Kumar Labh, Advocate

For the Respondents : None

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**

ORAL JUDGMENT

**Date: 14-12-2017**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs –

*“(A) A Certiorari for quashing and setting aside the order passed by the Licensing Authority-cum-Sub-Divisional Officer, Banka vide Memo No. 61 dated 16.01.2013 contained in Annexure-1 whereby and whereunder licence of the petitioner’s Fair Price Shop bearing no. 33/12 has been cancelled.*

*(B) A mandamus commanding the Respondents to restore the petitioner’s licence as before and to make allotment for the petitioner’s shop.*

*(C) Any other relief or reliefs for which petitioner may be found entitled in the fact and circumstances of the present case may be granted”.*

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 13 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. None appears on behalf of the respondents. 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 order passed by the Licensing Authority-cum-Sub-Divisional Officer, Banka vide Memo No. 61 dated 16.01.2013 (Annexure-1) is hereby quashed and the matter remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Banka 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.       |

