

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Letters Patent Appeal No.514 of 2019

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19445 of 2018

=====

Kalpana Kumari Wife of Ajay Kumar Resident of Village- Duariya, P.O.-
Bhawanipur, P.S.- Pratapganj, District- Supaul.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary Food and consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate Supaul.
4. The Additional Collector, Supaul.
5. The District Supply Officer Supaul.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer Birpur, Supaul.
7. Sudha Kumari @ Sudha Devi Wife of Om Prakash Yadav, Resident of Village- Bhirwa, P.O- Bhawanipur Uttar Ward No. -12, P.S.- Pratapganj, Distt. Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Ms. Shrishti Singh, Adv. Mr. Pranav Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG-5 Mr. Vishwambhar Prasad, AC to AAG-5
For Respondent No.7	:	Mr. Prashant Sinha, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

and

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

Date : 11-04-2023

Heard Ms. Shrishti Singh, learned advocate
for the appellant and Mr. Prashant Sinha, learned
advocate for the respondent no.7. We have also
heard Mr. Vishwambhar Prasad, learned advocate
for the State.

The appellant was given the licence to run



the Fair Price Shop in the event of respondent no.7 not having been found to have a computer degree.

The facts of the case is that against the advertisement for grant of licence in a particular area to run a Fair Price Shop, the appellant as well as respondent no.7, both had applied. The respondent no.7 was a graduate and also had a computer degree of Advance Diploma in Computer Application (ADCA). While filling up the form, respondent no.7 had not annexed the requisite certificates which was one of the essential requirements in the advertisement. However, permission was granted by the competent authority and a date was fixed for rectification/raising objections against the candidature of the others and further claim of the applicants.

It was in this context that after obtaining permission of the authorities, respondent no.7 was permitted to bring on record the requisite certificate of ADCA. However, the Screening Committee found that the certificate of computer



learning offered by respondent no.7 was collusive and therefore her claim was negated, making way for the appellant to be given the license to run the fair price shop.

This decision was challenged by the respondent no.7, who questioned the order passed by the authorities holding her candidature to be bad and granting licence to the appellant.

In the writ petition which was filed (C.W.J.C. No. 19445 of 2018), the learned single Judge took note of the fact that only under permission, the requisite certificate of computer knowledge was filed by the respondent no.7 and the assessment of the competent authority that such certificate was collusive, was without any substance as such statement was made without any investigation/verification on that account. Accordingly, the claim of respondent no.7 was allowed, the licence of the appellant was cancelled and respondent no.7 was given the licence to run the Fair Price Shop.

Ms. Shrishti Singh, learned advocate for



the appellant, had questioned the decision of the learned single Judge on two grounds that in view of the categorical requirement in the advertisement that all necessary certificates had to be enclosed along with the application form, the competent authorities could not have been so permissive to allow rectification of such application preferred by the aspirants. She has further submitted that once a decision had been taken by the competent authority holding the computer certificate in favour of respondent no.7 to be not reliable, a vested interest got created in favour of the appellant, which could not have been brushed aside lightly. Lastly, she has submitted that there has been no complaint whatsoever against her functioning as a PDS dealer.

After having heard the learned counsel for the parties, we find that the requisite certificate of qualification in computer of respondent no.7 was permitted to be filed by the competent authorities.

We are in agreement with the learned single Judge that such certificate could not have



been held to be, in the absence of any verification or inquiry or investigation, to be unreliable for acceptance. Even otherwise, if that certificate was taken into account, respondent no.7 had a higher qualification of graduation.

Thus, finding no fault with the decision of the learned single Judge, we do not have any reason to interfere with the order.

The appeal is thus, dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	12-04-2023
Transmission Date	

