

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5114 of 2024

Sanjay Kumar son of Yogendra Prasad, Resident of Village and P.O.-Manik Chowk (North), P.S. and Block-Runi Saidpur, District-Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Supply Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Pramandal, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sitamarhi, District-Sitamarhi.
5. The District Supply Officer, Sitamarhi.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Runisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.
7. The District Manager, State Food Corporation, Sitamarhi.
8. The Assistant Godown Manager, State Food Corporation, Runnisaidpur, District-Sitamarhi.
9. The District Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Virendra Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Government Pleader (3)

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

4 07-10-2024 Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

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

“That by the way of this writ application prayer is made to set aside/ quash the order passed by the Sub Divisional Officer Runi Saidpur Sitamarhi (Respondent No. 4) contained in letter no. 1043 dated 22.11.2023 (Annexure-4) whereby and whereunder P.D.S. License No. 72/08-12 PDS Code 120600101430 for the P.D.S. Centre of petitioner situated at Moh- Manik Chowk (North) Block (Prakhant) Runni Saidpur in District- Sitamarhi has been cancelled, only



in revengial manner as on account of that the petitioner had made complaint against the Asst. Godown manager State Food corporation Runnisaidpur Sitamarhi (Respondent no. 8) before Block (Prakhand) Supply Officer Runisaidpur (Respondent no.6 and the district Public Grievance Redressal officer Sitamarhi (Respondent No.9) complaining therein that Respondetn no.8 had delviered the grains (rice & wheat's) to the petitioner, without making measurement in less quantity and this Respondent no. 8 delivered 7 quintal 37 kg wheat in place 8 qtr. 22 kg, and like wise delivered 29 quintal 68 kg vice in place of 33 quintal resulting thereby the petitioner could not supply the grains to all beneficiaries. Further prayer is also made to issue direction to the respondents to reinstate the P.D.S. licence 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 judgment 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 exhausted all the remedies and all the authorities have found that the petitioner has violated the provisions of the Control Order, 2016. 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 reveal that there is any proposal of the action sought to be taken against the petitioner. Therefore, the same has to held as bad, illegal, contrary to the provisions of Rule 27(ii) of the Control Order and has to necessarily set aside.

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 Sub-Divisional Officer, Runi Saidpur Sitamarhi dated 22.11.2023 is 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 him 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 order 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			
---	--	--	--

