

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18623 of 2014

=====

Gupteshwar Prasad Son of Kashi Sao resident of Village - Patila, P.S. - Maner,
District - Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Additional District Magistrate (Supply), Patna.
4. The District Supply Officer, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Danapur, Patna.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Maner, District - Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binoy Kumar Sinha No. I,Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anirban Kundu, SC 24

Mr. Sudhanshu Shekhar, AC to SC 24

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 06-08-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for a direction to the respondents to consider the application of the petitioner for grant of licence of the Public Distribution System for the Patila village under Saurmarwa Gram Panchayat under Maner Block of Patna District; and for connected reliefs.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that an application for grant of PDS licence was filed by the petitioner as far back as in May, 2000, the same was not granted. This impelled the petitioner to approach this Court in CWJC No. 7146 of 2012,



but the learned single Judge was not inclined to interfere in the matter and the writ petition stood dismissed. Being aggrieved, the petitioner preferred LPA No. 882 of 2013, however, without success. The LPA was disposed of with the following observations—

“We find no reason to interfere with the order under appeal. Needless to state that if subsequently the respondents advertise for dealership and the petitioner applies, fulfilling the conditions, we expect his claims to be considered in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the present order.

The application is disposed.”

3. Learned counsel for the respondents appears and has been heard.

4. It appears that the petitioner is pursuing his application filed in May, 2000, only on the ground that one PDS shop still remains vacant for allotment. However, in view of the observations in LPA No. 882 of 2013 the petitioner has not been able to show that any fresh advertisement was made by the respondents or that he had filed any fresh application for grant of PDS licence. In view of the orders passed in LPA No. 882 of 2013



therefore, the present writ petition is not maintainable and stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	10.08.2018
Transmission Date	NA

