

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6076 of 2017

=====

Dinesh Singh, Son of Sri Dani Singh, Resident of Village-Kapasi, P.S.-
Sheikhpura, District-Sheikhpura.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Food & Civil Supply Department, Old Secretariat, Food & Civil Supply Department, Old Secretariat Patna.
2. The Collector, Sheikhpura.
3. The S.D.O., Sheikhpura.
4. The Block Supply Officer, Chewara, Sheikhpura.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Manish Kumar, AC to GP-4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 15-05-2018

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

2 The present writ petition has been filed challenging the
order dated 11.03.2017 passed by learned Commissioner, Munger
Division, Munger in Supply Revision Case No. 02/2016, whereby and
whereunder the revision preferred against the appellate order passed
by the Collector, Sheikhpura dated 21.02.2014 in Misc. Case No.
06/2014 was rejected and affirmed the order of the Sub-Divisional
Officer, Sheikhpura dated 30.03.2013 whereby licence of the petitioner
was cancelled.

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 revisional order dated 11.03.2017 passed in Supply Revision No. 02/2016 (Annexure-4), the appellate order dated 21.02.2014 passed in Misc. Case No. 06/2014 (Annexure-3) and the impugned order dated 30.03.2013 (Annexure-2) are hereby set aside and the matter is remanded to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Sheikhpura (respondent no. 3) to take a fresh decision in the matter after grant of reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner in accordance with law.
5. The writ petition stands allowed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NAFR
Uploading Date	22.05.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

