

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4162 of 2015

=====

Saroj Devi, wife of Moti Lal Prasad, Resident of village- Vrindawan, P.O.-
Vrindawan, Gram Panchayat Raj Vrindawan, Block- Thawe, District- Gopalganj.
..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Collector, Gopalganj.
2. The Collector, Gopalganj.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj.

..... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey No-5, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Jitendra Kr. Roy, SC 13

Mr. U.K. Singh, AC to SC 13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 03-08-2018

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

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

*“(a) Quashing of the order dated 23.12.2014
(Annexure-4) passed by the court of learned Collector,
Gopalganj; passed in Supply Appeal No. 40/14 by which
the Supply Appeal No. 40/14 has been rejected at the
stage of admission itself on the grounds of limitation.*

*(b) And further for the quashing of the order contained
in Letter No. 697 dated 18.03.2008 (part of Annexure-
3) passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Gopalganj - by
which the P.D.S. License of the Petitioner has been
cancelled.*

*(c) And further for a direction to the Collector,
Gopalganj to restore the P.D.S. License of the
petitioner.”*



3. At the very outset, this Court takes note that remedy by way of revision before the Divisional Commissioner is available to the petitioner against the impugned order passed in Supply Appeal No. 40/14, which has not been availed of by the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly accepts that remedy by way of revision is available

5. In view of availability of the alternative remedy as above, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The writ petition stands dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to file a revision petition before the Divisional Commissioner for redressal of her grievances.

6. It is made clear that in case such a revision petition is filed, the concerned authority would have regard to the present proceeding being pursued by the petitioner, while considering any issue relating to condonation of delay, if applicable.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	07.08.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

