

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6318 of 2011

=====

Shankaracharya Yadav @ Shakaracharya S/O Late Suraj Narayan Yadav R/O
Vill Naya Tola, Bishunpur, P.S.Chhapra Muffasil, Distt-Saran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Commissioner, Saran Division, Chapra
3. The Collector, Saran
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sadar, Chapra

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Anand, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Parth Sharthi, SC10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 19-07-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for the following
reliefs—

- (i) *For setting aside the memo no. 849/Supply, Sadar, Chapra dated 24.05.2008 whereby and whereunder the licence no. 6/90 for running Public Distribution shop was cancelled on the ground that the reply to the show cause is found unsatisfactory.*
- (ii) *For setting aside the order dated 07.12.2008 passed by the District Magistrate, Saran at Chapra in Supply Appeal No. 25/2008 whereby and whereunder the order of the SDO., Saran at Chapra was affirmed after dismissing the appeal.*
- (iii) *To set aside the order dated 30.11.2010 passed by the Commissioner, Saran at Chapra whereby and whereunder the revision preferred by the petitioner*



was rejected and order of the SDO, Saran at Chapra and District Magistrate was affirmed.

2. At the very outset, learned counsel for the respondents points out that the petitioner’s case is almost identical to 11 other PDS dealers whose licences have also similarly been cancelled. Such dealers approached this Court in CWJC No. 18047 of 2008 (Md. Aslam vs. The State of Bihar and Ors.) without success. Thereafter the said dealers preferred LPA No. 1800 of 2010 which was also dismissed granting liberty to file a review petition.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents makes a statement at the Bar that such review was filed and the same also stood dismissed.

4. Considering that the parties have requested to dispose of this matter after disposal of LPA No. 1800 of 2010 and also that the petitioner’s case is admittedly almost identical to the case of such other dealers, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve any relief.

5. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	23.07.2018
Transmission Date	NA

