

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14083 of 2014

=====

Ram Deo Choudhary Son of Late Satya Narayan Choudhary Resident of Village
Mogla Ghat (Nandna), P.S. Jadia, District - Supaul.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

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

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Devi Das Srivastava, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. GA9- ANIL KUMAR SINHA

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 23-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the order
dated 06.05.2010 passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, Triveniganj,
District Supaul fully contained in Memo No. 178-2 whereby and
whereunder the PDS licence bearing Licence No. 04/1992 granted to the
petitioner for running a PDS has been cancelled.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner
was granted only 24 hours time to reply to the show cause notice dated
26.04.2010 (Annexure-3) which was clearly insufficient. It is submitted
that the petitioner's case is squarely covered by a decision of this Court in



the case of *Smt. Fulpati Devi Vs. The State of Bihar*, 2013(1) PLJR 718 wherein it has been observed as follows—

“3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner could not know about the notice as she was ill during the period. Hence, she did not file show cause and in her absence the Sub-Divisional Officer passed the impugned order cancelling her licence. He also submits that in appeal petitioner had brought this issue as ground no. (B) in the memo of appeal but the Collector has not considered the same and has brushed aside the ground taken by the petitioner and held that the ground of illness taken by the petitioner appears to be ‘Post Thought’. He submits that illness or no illness, only three days time was allowed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, which was very short, and thereafter, he passed final orders within one week, without ensuring that notice was served on her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be correct. From the impugned order of the Sub-Divisional Officer also it does not appear that he has take care to ascertain service of notice was affected on the petitioner or not. The fact that after issue of notice on 16th of November, 2011 he passed final orders on 22nd of November, 2011 without mentioning in his order that the notice had been served on the petitioner, shows that he acted in hot haste.”

4. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been



heard. No counter affidavit has been filed till date.

5. In the above view of the matter, the impugned order dated 06.05.2010 contained in Memo No. 178-2 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul (Respondent No. 3) is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded to him to take a fresh decision in the matter after grant of reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner in accordance with law. Licence of the petitioner shall be restored without delay until fresh orders are passed by the respondent no. 3.

6. The writ petition stands allowed as above.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.07.2018
Transmission Date	NA

