

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12623 of 2018

=====

Yamuna Ram, Son of Late Jokhu Ram, resident of Village- Ward No. 15 Hardiya
P.O. Barwatsena, P.S. Barwatsena, District- Bettiah.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
3. The District Magistrate, West Champaran at Bettiah.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bettiah, West Champaran.
5. The District Supply Officer, Bettiah.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Sikta, Narkatiyaganj, West Champaran.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Mishra, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. Arvind Ujjwal, SC4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 10-07-2018

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

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

“(i) For quashing the order contained in Memo No. 147 dated 17.03.2017 passed by respondent no. 4 by which the license of the petitioner has been cancelled.

(ii) For quashing the order dated 11.05.2018 passed in Case No. CRM-04/2017-18 passed by the respondent District Magistrate by which the appeal has been dismissed.

(iii) For direction upon the respondent authorities to restore the license of the petitioner forthwith.

iv) Any other order or orders as your Lordships may deem



fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case be granted to the petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an insufficient opportunity of three days was granted for filing show cause and the impugned order has been passed as the petitioner was unable to file the show cause within the stipulated time. In fact, there is nothing on the record to indicate that the show cause notice had been served on the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner's case is squarely covered by a decision of this Court in the case of *Smt. Fulpati Devi Vs. The State of Bihar, 2013(1) PLJR 718*, wherein it has been observed as follows –

“3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner could not know about the notice as she was ill during the period. Hence, she did not file show cause and in her absence the Sub-Divisional Officer passed the impugned order cancelling her licence. He also submits that in appeal petitioner had brought this issue as ground no. (B) in the memo of appeal but the Collector has not considered the same and has brushed aside the ground taken by the petitioner and held that the ground of illness taken by the petitioner appears to be ‘Post Thought’. He submits that illness or no illness, only three days time was allowed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, which was very short, and thereafter, he passed final orders within one week, without ensuring that notice was served on her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner appears to be correct. From the impugned order of the Sub-Divisional Officer also it does not appear that he has



take care to ascertain service of notice was affected on the petitioner or not. The fact that after issue of notice on 16th of November, 2011 he passed final orders on 22nd of November, 2011 without mentioning in his order that the notice had been served on the petitioner, shows that he acted in hot haste.”

4. In the above view of the matter, the impugned order dated 17.03.2017 (Annexure-1) and the appellate order dated 11.05.2018 (Annexure-2) are hereby set aside and the matter is remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Bettiah, West Champaran (respondent no. 2) to take a fresh decision in the matter after grant of reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner in accordance with law. Supplies to the petitioner shall be restored without delay until fresh orders are passed by the respondent no. 4.

5. The writ petition stands allowed as above.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	17.07.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

