

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3060 of 2019

=====

Sujata Kumari aged about 27 years (Female), W/o Ujjawal Kumar Resident of Village-Sonama,P.O.-Kothia,P.S. Didarganj,Dist.-Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Food Consumer Protection Department,Govt. of Bihar, Patna
2. The Chairman, District Level Selection Committee,District-Patna
3. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate,Patna
4. The District Supply Officer, Patna
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City,Dist.-Patna
6. The Block Supply Officer, Patna Sadar,Dist.-Patna
7. Bindi Devi Sri Ram Sujit Kumar Resident of Village - Mohammadpur, P.O. Kothia, P.S. Didarganj, Dist.-Patna

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate Ms. Preety Kunwar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, Sr. Advocate (AAG-5)
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Alok Ranjan, AC to AAG-5

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

- 2. 25-06-2019** In the nature of the controversy raised with respect to the name of the village as appearing in the advertisement and claim of the petitioner that she belongs to village – Sonama, after some argument, learned senior counsel representing the petitioner submits that this court may take an appropriate view of the matter and issue necessary direction in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Learned counsel for the State submits that the objection of the petitioner has been duly considered by the Sub-



Divisional Officer and the same has been rejected vide Annexure '5' to the Writ Application giving reasons in support thereof. It is also submitted that in case the petitioner has any grievance against Annexure '5' she has a remedy of statutory appeal provided under the Bihar Targeted PDS (Control) Order, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Control Order, 2016').

After hearing learned senior counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State, this court finds that the nature of the dispute raised by the petitioner is with regard to the name of the village mentioned in the advertisement. It is her case that village – Gyanchak, Sonama is to be interpreted as if the applicant having their place of business in any one of the villages may be considered for the Sonama Gram Panchayat.

So far as respondent no. 7 is concerned, she has her business place at Gyanchak and the Sub-Divisional Officer has taken a view that in the Gram Panchayat Sonama village – Gyanchak is the recognized business place as per advertisement.

This court is of the considered opinion that such grievance may be raised, if so advised, in accordance with the provisions of Control Order, 2016 before the respondent no. 3 who is the statutory authority to decide an appeal against grant of P.D.S. License. If any appropriate application/appeal is



preferred by the petitioner, the same will be considered within the statutory period.

So far as the writ jurisdiction of this court is concerned, it is not the appropriate jurisdiction to decide the kind of dispute raised in the present writ application.

Accordingly, this Writ application stands disposed of.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

