

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3974 of 2019

Anita Kumari W/o Sri Prakash Sahu, Resident of Village Belaon, Police Station - Sikraul, District-Buxar, Bihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and consumer Protection Department ,Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Additional Secretary, Food and consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar Patna
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna
4. The District Magistrate, Buxar
5. The District Supply Officer Cum Secretary, District Selection Committee, Buxar
6. The District Statistical Office, Buxar
7. The District Co-operative Officer, Buxar
8. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Buxar
9. The District Manager, State Food Corporation, Buxar
10. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dumraon, Police Station-Dumraon, District Buxar
11. The Block Development officer, Nawanagar, Police Station-Nawanagar, District Buxar
12. The Block Supply officer, Nawanagar, Police Station-Nawanagar, District-Buxar
13. The Circle Officer, Nawanagar, Police Station Nawanagar, District Buxar
14. The Block Supply Inspector, Nawanagar, Police Station-Nawanagar, District-Buxar
15. Smt. Vijeta Kumari wife of Umesh Kumar, Resident of Village and Post Office-Beloan, Police Station-Sikraul, District-Buxar.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Singh No. 4, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Md. Anisul Haque, A.C. to AAG-5

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 10-07-2019 This Court is not persuaded to interfere with the
appointment of private respondent no. 15 on the ground that her



application was received in the office of the licensing authority on 27.06.2018 for the reason that the petitioner has not pleaded before this Court that private respondent had made her application after the cut-off date on 25.06.2017. In other words, if the private respondent no. 15 had posted her application on or before 25.06.2017, it reached in the office of the licensing authority on 27.06.2017 and the licensing authority has accepted the said application, no fault may be found with the discretion exercised by the licensing authority in this regard. This Court would not be willing to interfere with the same also for the reason that it is not only that the application of private respondent no. 15 has been accepted rather all other applications of similar nature have been accepted by the licensing authority. On the merit front, there is no dispute that private respondent is a better candidate. Thus, the sole ground on which the writ application has been preferred, the writ application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

ved/vats

U			
---	--	--	--

