

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19994 of 2021

=====

Jagarnath Pandey, S/o Late Mukhdeo Pandey, Resident of Village - Chankhap,
P.S. - Kutumba, District - Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
2. District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
3. District Supply Officer, Aurangabad.
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Aurangabad.
5. Block Supply Officer, Kutumba, District - Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Binod Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (S.C.4)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. KUMAR)

(The proceedings of the Court are being conducted through Video Conferencing and the Advocates joined the proceedings through Video Conferencing from their residence.)

Date : 15-02-2022

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has prayed for the following relief(s):-

“(i) For issuance of appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the Memo No. 1662/Aa dated 24.09.2007 issued by Sub-Divisional Officer, Aurangabad by which the Licence of shop of Public Distribution System (further known of P.D.S. shop) of the petitioner vide Licence No. 22/K/1991 was cancelled and also quashing the order dated 14.09.2021 passed in P.D.S. Appeal No. 397/2019 passed by District Magistrate, Aurangabad by which appeal filed by petitioner was dismissed and confirmed the order regarding cancellation of licence.

- (ii) For issuance of appropriate writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to renew the Licence of P.D.S. shop of the petitioner vide Licence No. 22/K/1991 and accordingly supply the articles.
- (iii) To grant any other relief/reliefs to which the petitioner may be found entitled to in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty to approach the Revisional Authority for redressal of his grievances as permissible in law.

This application is dismissed as withdrawn reserving liberty to the writ petitioner to take recourse to such remedies as are otherwise available in accordance with law.

However, it is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and all issues of facts and law are left open.

(Sanjay Karol, CJ)

(S. Kumar, J)

veena/rajiv-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	