

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11819 of 2023**

=====

Ram Chandra Prasad S/o Late Bhatu Saw Resident of Village-Surhi, P.S.-  
Islampur, Distirct-Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Nalanda at Biharsharif
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Hilsa, Nalanda.
4. The Distirct Supply Officer, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
5. The Block Supply Officer, Islampur, Nalanda at Biharsharif

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhananjaya Nath Tiwari, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad (Aag5)

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      13-10-2023                      Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

2. This writ petition has been filed for seeking the  
following relief(s)

“That this writ petition is being filed on behalf of the petitioner for quashing the order contained in memo No. 949 dated 06.05.2019 pssed by the lerned Sub Divisional Officer Sadar Hilsa (Nalanda) by which the PDS license of the petitioner being Licence No. 07/2007 has been cancelled and further for quashing the appellate order dated 09.06.2023 passed in Supply Case No. 10/2023 passed by the Learned Collector cum-District Magistrate, nalanda at Biharsharif by which he was pleased to dismissed the appeal and affirmed the order of the licensing authority dated 06.05.2019 and further be pleased to restore the license and supply of the petitioner..”



3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has stated that in the Show Cause Notice issued by the Sub-Divisional Officer there is no proposal for cancellation of the license. Learned counsel has stated that non-mentioning of the proposal for cancelling his license is contrary to the provisions of order 27(ii) of the Bihar Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Order, 2016').

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied on the judgment of the full Bench passed in CWJC No.21202 of 2021 and analogous cases dated 26.09.2023 to buttress his contention that non-mentioning of the proposed action in the show-cause notice is bad in law and contrary to Rule 27(ii) of the Control Order, 2016.

5. Learned counsel has stated in view of the above mentioned provisions of law and judgments relied by the petitioner, the impugned order may be set aside and matter remanded back to the authorities concerned for issuing a fresh show-cause notice in terms of order 27(ii) of the Control Order, 2016 and thereafter take necessary action.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has vehemently opposed the very



maintainability of the writ petition and stated that the present writ petition is not maintainable as the petitioner has an alternative and efficacious remedy of filing a revision before the Commissioner. Learned counsel has therefore prayed this Hon'ble Court to dismiss the present writ petition.

7. This Hon'ble Court in CWJC No.21202 of 2021 and analogous cases has held as under:

“19. Accordingly, we answer the reference as under:-

It is mandatory for a licensing authority issuing a notice under order 27(ii) to a license to mention that there is a proposal for cancellation of his license, failing which such notice cannot be treated to be a valid notice of giving sufficient opportunity to the licensee to state his case under order 27(ii) of the BTPDS Control Order. ”

8. A perusal of the show-cause notice issued to the petitioner does not reveals that there is no proposal of the action sought to be taken against the petitioner.

9. Having regard to the above facts and circumstances and the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court, the present CWJC is allowed. The impugned order passed by the appellate authority as well as the Sub-Divisional Officer are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub-divisional Officer for issuing a fresh show-cause notice to the petitioner strictly in



compliance with the provisions of Rule 27(ii) of the Control Order, 2016 and call for his explanation by giving reasonable time.

**10.** On such show-cause notice being served, the petitioner shall file his explanation within the stipulated time. On receipt of the explanation submitted by the petitioner the authority concerned shall pass a reasoned orders strictly in accordance with law duly taking into consideration the explanation submitted by the petitioner.

**11.** It is needless to mention that before passing any orders, the petitioner shall be given an opportunity of hearing. The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Any order passed shall be communicated to the petitioner.

**12.** With the above directions, this Writ Petition is allowed to the extent indicated above.

**(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)**

Gauravkr/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

