

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10674 of 2024**

=====

Diwakar Singh son of Late Chhotu Singh, resident of Village-Siur, Police Station and Block-Roh, District-Nawadah.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Food Supply and Consumer Affairs, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Nawadah.
3. The District Co-operative Officer, Nawadah.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer cum Licensing Authority, Rajauli, District-Nawadah.
5. The Block Supply Officer, Roh, District-Nawadah.
6. The Block Co-operative Officer, Roh, District-Nawadah.
7. The Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Nawadah Anchal, Nawadah.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader 11

=====

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

2      02-08-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief(s):-

*“(i) For issuance of appropriate order/orders, direction/directions, writ/writs specially in the nature of certiorari setting aside the impugned order bearing Memo No. 1340 dated 18.06.2024 issued from the level of Respondent No. 4 under which in pursuant to enquiry report submitted by three men committee constituted for conducting the enquiry with regard to continuance of P.D.S. Licence since 1985 to till date in name of dissolved Shramik Sahyog Samittee prior to 1985 itself but without serving the said enquiry*



*report to the petitioner the P.D.S. Licence of petitioner has been cancelled in gross violation of principle of Natural Justice.*

*(ii) For reinstatement of P.D.S. licence of petitioner and allow him to operate P.D.S. shop in continuity as there is no allegation of any kind of irregularities committed in running P.D.S. shop rather after more than 39 years of issuance of PDS Licence in favour of petitioner in year 1985 which has been twice renotified after having renewed the same but now on technical ground on the basis of one private person who is not concerned with P.D.S. shop of petitioner the licence of petitioner has illegally been cancelled.*

*(iii) For further direction upon the Respondent No. 5 to rectify the continuity of mentioning the status of petitioner in P.D.S. licence as Secretary of Shramik Sahyog Samittee, Siur, Block- Roh, District- Nawadah despite the fact that necessary recommendation were made by the competent authorities to the licensing authority much earlier in year 2007 as well as in year 2019 but same could not be rectified due to laches on the part of Respondents and now petitioner has been victimised for same cause of action which was earlier given rest by the authorities himself.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that the authorities have issued the show cause notice dated 31.05.2024 wherein it is mentioned that based on the enquiry report submitted by three men committee the decision has been taken to issue the said show cause notice.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has stated that



without enclosing the copy of the show cause notice the authorities are trying to take action against the petitioner and the same is impermissible under the law.

4. Further learned counsel has relied on the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 wherein this Hon'ble Court has held that the non-supply of the enquiry report along with the show-cause is bad and against the principle of natural justice and equity.

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 furnishing a copy of the enquiry report and any other material that they seek to rely on and give an opportunity of filing his explanation 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 an appeal before the District Magistrate. Learned counsel has therefore prayed this Hon'ble Court to dismiss the present writ petition.



7. This Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 held as under:

*"In my opinion, irregularities in maintenance of notice board or maintenance of the stocks within the premises of the petitioner are too trivial and cannot form a basis for cancellation of licence. No doubt there were other serious charges against the petitioner regarding non-issuance of cash-memo to the consumers, distribution of lesser amount of kerosene oil and non-distribution of foodgrains but surprisingly even while making such allegations, the names of such consumers who are dissatisfied by such action of the petitioner are conspicuously missing. The allegations are sweeping in nature without reference to any specific consumer.*

*In my opinion the non-supply of the enquiry report conducted by the District Level Committee which is the foundation for issuance of show cause notice placed at Annexure-1 as well as non-supply of names of such of the consumers who had complained against the petitioner as regarding the irregularities in distribution of the food-grains or the kerosene oil has prejudiced the petitioner to file his purposeful reply and in absence thereof, the order impugned in my opinion, are based on no materials.*

*Though it was strenuously argued by Mr. Pandey that in absence of any response by*



*the petitioner the allegations would be deemed to have been admitted but in my opinion even if the show cause reply was missing, the orders passed by the statutory authorities having civil consequences and resulting in cancellation should reflect application of mind. Unfortunately it is grossly missing inasmuch as neither the order of the Licensing Authority nor the order of the appellate authority deal with the materials which formed the basis to drive home the charges. The orders impugned are indefensible and cannot be upheld."*

8. A perusal of the show-cause notice issued to the petitioner does not reveal that the copy of the enquiry report was enclosed along with the show-cause notice.

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 dated 18.06.2024 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer is set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub-divisional Officer (Respondent No. 4) for furnishing a copy of the enquiry report and any other material relied by the authority on the petitioner 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 order, 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 |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

