

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14453 of 2017

=====

Madan Prasad Gupta Son of Late Govind Prasad Sao, Resident of Village-
Baghi Bagdiha, P.S.- Warisaliganj, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The District Magistrate, Nawada.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Nawada Sadar.
4. The Block Supply Officer, Warisaliganj, Nawada.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prince Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. U.P. Singh, AC to SC 4

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH
SHARMA**

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 20-03-2023

1. The petitioner by way of this writ petition assails the order of cancellation of a license dated 28.12.2016 and the appellate order dated 24.06.2017, whereby the appeal preferred against the cancellation order was rejected. Learned counsel submits that the contention raised by the petitioner in reply to the show cause has not been considered by the S.D.O. nor the appellate authority has considered his submissions in a proper manner.

2. I have considered the submission and perused the orders passed by the S.D.O., whereby he cancelled the license of the petitioner and the order passed in appeal found



that the petitioner was given due opportunities by the S.D.O. before passing the order impugned and his contentions have been all considered one by one in the order of cancellation of license. The decision-making process thus has been found to be in accordance with the law and fair opportunity has been provided. No perversity can also be said to have been committed as contentions have been dealt with, and, findings have been arrived at both by the S.D.O. and the appellate authority. After having noticed the contentions of the petitioner it has found that in support of his defence, sufficient proof was not provided and has therefore upheld the order. In view of the above, this Court finds that both the authorities have independently examined the contentions of the petitioner and reached to a similar conclusion.

3. In view thereof, no interference is warranted.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(Sanjeev Prakash Sharma, J)

Sachin/-
Item No. 17

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

