

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3519 of 2019

Bindu Shekhar Prasad, S/o Late Chandra Shekhar Prasad, Resident of Gayatri Nagar, Road No. 3, Ward No. 1, P.O. and P.s.-Jamalpur, Distt.-Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna
2. The Commissioner Munger Division, Munger
3. The District Level Selection Committee Munger through its Chairman
4. The District Magistrate Munger
5. The Sub Divisional Officer Sadar Munger
6. The Block Supply Officer Munger
7. Samir Kumar S/o Late Bangali Tanti Resident of Chhoti Daulatpur, Near Shiv Mandir, P.s.-Jamalpur, Distt.-Munger

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Anand
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad (AAG5)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 02-07-2019 Petitioner, in the present case, is aggrieved by the selection of private respondent no.7 for grant of PDS licence in ward no.1 of Jamalpur Nagar Parishad, Sadar Munger. It is contended that the petitioner has filed his objection before the respondent no.2 on 21.01.2019 but the same has not been considered by the respondent no.2 so far.

Learned counsel for the State submits that in case the petitioner is aggrieved by any action of the District Selection Committee he should submit his appeal/objection, as the case may be, before the District Magistrate, Munger (respondent



no.4) and he may be directed to look into the same and an appropriate decision thereon may be taken by him.

In the given facts and circumstances of the case, liberty is granted to the petitioner to make an appropriate application/objection/appeal before the District Magistrate, Munger (respondent no.4) within a period of thirty days from today. In case such an objection/application/appeal is preferred before the respondent no.4, the same will be considered by him in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of filing of the application.

It, however, goes without saying that in case the respondent no.4 proposes to pass any order adverse to the interest of the private respondent no.7 an opportunity of hearing must be given to him before passing any order.

This writ application stands disposed off accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

U			
---	--	--	--

