

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5382 of 2016

=====

Manju Devi Wife of Sri Rampravesh Singh, Resident of village and Post-
Parsawan, P.S.- N.T.P.C., District- Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

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

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajeev Kumar Labh

For the Respondent/s : Mr. PRASHANT PRATAP, GP6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 15-01-2018

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

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the order contained in memo no. 79 dated 15.02.2016 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Barh by which licence of the petitioner's Fair Price shop bearing no. 234/07 has been cancelled and monthly allotment has been stopped; and further to restore the petitioner's licence.

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 she 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 para 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. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard.

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 dated 15.02.2016 (Annexure-1) is hereby quashed and the matter remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Barh (respondent no. 3) 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)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	16.01.2018
Transmission Date	NA

