

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12436 of 2016

=====

Madhav Prasad Singh, S/o Late Radhika Prasad Singh, resident of Village - Narwara, P.O.-Narwara, P.S.- Tariyani, Distt.- Sheohar.

.... Petitione

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Deptt. of Food & Civil Supplies, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Collector, Sheohar.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sheohar.
5. The Block Development Officer, Dumri Katsari, Sheohar.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Sheohar.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sunil Kumar Verma, Advocate.
For the Respondents : MD.Raisul Haque, SC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 15-01-2018

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

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

*“ (i) To quash the order dated 07.06.2016 passed by the
learned Collector, Sheohar in Supply Appeal Case No.
14/16 rejecting thereunder the appeal filed by the
petitioner and affirming the order contained in Memo No.
34 dated 19.02.2016 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer,
Sheohar.*

*(ii) To further quash the order contained in Memo No. 34
dated 19.02.2016 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer,
Sheohar cancelling thereunder the retail food grains
dealers licence under the Public Distribution System being
no. 32/85 with immediate effect.*

*(iii) to direct the appropriate respondent authorities to
restore the said retail food grains dealers licence under the
Public Distribution System being licence no. 32/85*



forthwith as also to resume supply/allotment of food grains/commodities against licence no. 32/85 standing in the name of the petitioner.

(iv) To any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner is found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the case."

3. At the very outset, this Court takes note that the petitioner has remedy of revision against the appellate order dated 07.06.2016 passed in Supply Appeal Case No. 14 of 2016 (Annexure-8). Learned counsel for the petitioner accepts that such remedy would be available.

4. In the above circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the revisional authority, if so advised, against the impugned appellate order.

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)

Md. Ibrarul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	19.01.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

