

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17607 of 2015

=====
Bindeshwari Prasad Yadav son of Late Mangal Yadav, resident of village-
Maheshwa, P.S.- Madhepura, District- Madhepura

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Collector, Madhepura
2. The SDO, Madhepura
3. The Block Supply Officer, Murliganj, Madhepura
4. The Block Supply Officer, Singheshwar, Madhepura

.... Respondents

=====
Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. Nawal Kishore Singh, SC-2

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

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-08-2018

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

2. The present writ petition has been filed for
challenging the order dated 03.06.2014 passed by the S.D.O.
Madhepura contained in Memo no. 137 by which the license of the
petitioner being license no. 34/2007 has been cancelled.

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-14 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 has been relied upon
in the impugned order.



4. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard. 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 impugned order dated 03.06.2014 (Annexure-6) is hereby quashed and the matter remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Madhepura, 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. License of the petitioner shall be restored without delay until fresh orders are passed by the respondent no. 2.

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)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	20.08.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

