

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20299 of 2019

=====

Priyanka Devi Wife of Satyendra Kumar Gupta, Resident of Village- Niyay,
P.O.- Muradabad, P.S. Agrer, District- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Affairs, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate Cum Chairman, District Selection Committee, Rohtas at Sasaram.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer Cum Licensing Authority, Rohtas at Sasaram.
4. The Block Development Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas.
5. The District Public Grievance Redressal Cell, Sasaram, District- Rohtas.
6. The Circle Officer, Sasaram, District- Rohtas.
7. The Block Supply Officer, Sasaram, Rohtas.
8. Rokshana Bano, Wife of Saddam Hussain Ansari Resident of Village- Niyay, P.O. Muradabad, P.S. Agrer, District- Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

2 13-01-2023 Heard Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwari, learned advocate

for the petitioner and Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh for the

State.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has

challenged the grant of licence to respondent no. 8 on

the ground that her candidature is better and that the



complaint registered against selection of respondent no. 8 as a licensee was never adverted to.

Considering the nature of controversy raised by the petitioner and in view of the notification dated 21.07.2022 issued by the Government in exercise of the powers conferred under Sections 3 and 5 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 read with Clause-36 of the Bihar Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2016, we deem it appropriate to direct that if a suitable complaint in that regard is filed by the petitioner within a period of 30 days before the Divisional Commissioner, the Divisional Commissioner shall take up the matter hear all stakeholders including respondent no. 8 and shall pass an order within the next 60 days.

The order so passed by the authority shall be made available to the petitioner as well as the Respondent No. 8.

We have specifically asked Respondent No. 8 to be heard by the Divisional Commissioner as the present



order is being passed in her absence.

The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/Rishi

U			
---	--	--	--

