

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

(Heard through VC)

CWP No.7960 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: June 10, 2020

Rajbir

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Shalender Mohan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Addl. AG Haryana.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The petitioner herein is aggrieved against the order dated 11.05.2020 (Annexure P-7) passed by respondent No.3 whereby, the licence of the petitioner to supply ration has been suspended with immediate effect.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is running a fair price shop in Dabur Colony, Panipat and is supplying the ration to the card holders under public distribution system without any complaint against him since the year 2005. However, it is only on account of inimical attitude of the Food Inspectors that an FIR has been falsely registered against him and the impugned order dated 11.05.2020 has been passed whereby, he has been estopped from distributing ration.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in fact, the petitioner had already cut the ration slip and the ration was to be supplied, and, therefore, it cannot be said that he had excess stock. It is argued that the cardholders attached to the depot have no complaint against him.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, on the asking of the court, Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Addl. AG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and would submit that it is on the basis of physical verification done that it was found that the petitioner herein had excess ration in his depot, which led to the passing of the impugned order.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and with their valuable assistance, have perused the pleadings of the case.

The petitioner herein has already moved a detailed application for restoration of his licence to supply ration, which representation has not been decided as on date. At this stage, without going into the merits of the case, the instant petition is being disposed of, giving a direction to the respondent-State to decide the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law, by providing one adequate opportunity of hearing to him, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Ordered accordingly.

June 10, 2020

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No