

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11671 of 2014

=====

Md. Jalil, S/O- Late Dahmali Mian, R/O/V- Gapalpur, Panchayat Parihari, P.S.-
Raniganj, District Araria

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate, Araria
3. The S.D.O., Araria
4. Block Supply Officer, Raniganj Block, District- Araria

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arun,
Mr. Sajid Salim Khan, Advocates
For the Respondents : Mr. AJAY, GA 5
Mr. A.S. Lal, AC to GA 5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 31-07-2018

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 –

*“(i) For, issuance of appropriate writ/writs, order/
orders, for quashing of the order dated 21.1.14 passed in
control order appeal no. 19/2013-14 by which
respondent no. 2, whereby the said respondent dismissed
the appeal of the petitioner on improper & illegal
grounds.*

*(ii) For, quashing the order dated 10.8.13, passed by the
respondent no. 3, whereby the said respondent cancelled
the PDS license of the petitioner on baseless grounds.*

*(iii) For, issuance of order/orders, direction, directing the
respondents to restore the PDS license of the petitioner as
the same was cancelled arbitrarily without following the*



due process of law.
(iv) For, issuance of any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner may be entitled to in the facts & circumstances of the case.”

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 dated 21.01.2014 passed in Control Order Appeal no. 19/2013-14, which has not been availed of by the petitioner.

4. 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 his grievances.

5. 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	02.08.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

