

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6070 of 2017

Md. Kalim Anwar Quraishi @ Kalim Anwar @ Md. Kalim Son of Late Md. Ali Murtuza @ Murtuza Quraishi, resident of Mohalla- Dharampur Ward No.- 2, P.S. Samastipur, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Principal Secretary, Department of Urban Development, Government of Bihar, Patna.
5. The District Magistrate, Samastipur, District- Samastipur.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Samastipur, District- Samastipur.
7. The Nagar Parishad Samastipur through its Executive Officer.
8. The Chairman, Nagar Parishad Samastipur District- Samastipur.
9. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad Samastipur District- Samastipur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Md. Anis Akhtar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Shiv Kumar AC to GA-3
For Nagar Parishad	:	Mr. Durganand Jha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-02-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Municipality.

The present writ application has been filed seeking quashing of the Letter No. 631 dated 12.04.2017 (*Annexure-7*) issued by the Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad, Samastipur whereby a general notice has been issued directing the petitioner and others to stop the skinning or disemboweling of animals and related trades. The next prayer of the petitioner is to direct the



authorities to supply the documents as demanded by the petitioner vide his application dated 08.11.2016 and after supplying the same to provide personal hearing to the petitioner so that the petitioner is in a position to explain the entire issue. Further, for a direction to renew the license after 2010 relating to the skinning or disemboweling of animals after taking late fee. It appears to the Court that the writ application is misconceived, for the reason that from perusal of *Annexure-7*, it would manifest that it clearly records that the license of the petitioner expired in the year 2010, thereafter, the petitioner continued with his work in absence of license and when complaints were made that the petitioner is indulging in trade relating to animal in absence of license, the matter was taken up and thereafter *Annexure-7* was issued on 12.04.2017, further the said *Annexure-7* clearly recorded that the renewal of license of the petitioner has also been rejected.

Since, the renewal application of the petitioner for license has been rejected as such, the Court for the present cannot grant any relief as the refusal of renewal of the license of the petitioner is not under challenge in the present writ application. Further, from perusal of the application of the petitioner dated 08.11.2016 (*Annexure-6*) it does not even



remotely manifest that as to what documents were asked for by the petitioner from the authorities.

Since the order refusing renewal of license as recorded in Annexure-7, has not been challenged, as such, the prayer made in the writ application does not merit consideration.

The writ petition is dismissed.

However, the petitioner would be at liberty to challenge the order by which his renewal of license was refused.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

