

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1546 of 2019

=====

Poonam Kumari, W/o Dhananjay Kumar, Resident of Village- Mishrawalia,
P.s.- Kochas, Dist- Rohtas, Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Level Selection Committee, Rohtas through its Chairman.
3. The District Magistrate, Rohtas
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas.
5. The Block Supply Officer Sasaram, Rohtas
6. Shalini Kumari, W/o Bijendra Singh, R/o- Village-Kothuan, P.S. Karghar, Dist-Rohtas

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Kumar Tiwari
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 01-02-2019 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the private respondent, Shalini Kumari's name appears at Serial No.16 in Annexure '3' as a Scheduled Caste candidate and had applied under the said category but her name has been recommended for issuance of license against the seat vacant for unreserved category. Learned counsel submits that an objection in this regard has also been submitted to the office of the District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Rohtas but the same has not been considered and the respondents are likely to issue license to private respondents very soon.

Learned counsel for the State is present.



In the nature of controversy raised and the facts given that the license is likely to be issued to the private respondent no.6, this Court thinks it just and proper to direct the District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Rohtas to look into the objections of the petitioner as contained in Annexure-5 herein, consider the same and before issuance of license to private respondent no. 6, a decision must be taken on the objection of the petitioner. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Rohtas shall hear both the petitioner as well as private respondent no. 6 if he would be willing to interfere with the recommendations made in favour of private respondent no. 6.

This writ application stands disposed of, accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

R.R.Ojha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

