

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.1949 of 2022

In
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7059 of 2022

=====

Mokhtar Ram, Son of Jitu Ram, Resident of Villa.- Remura, P.O.- Koyla,
Anchal - Charpokhara, Distt. - Bhojpur, Bihar, Pin Code - 802223.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Bhojpur.
3. The District Magistrate-cum-Collector, Bhojpur.
4. The District Supply Officer, Bhojpur.
5. The Additional District Supply Officer, Bhojpur.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Piro, Ara.
7. The Block Supply Officer, Piro, Bhojpur, Ara.
8. Kalamuddin Ansari, resident of Villa - Remura, P.O. - Koyla, Anchal - Charpokhara, Distt. Bhojpur, Bihar, Pin Code - 802223.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nishant Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arvind Ujjwal, SC- 4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)

3 13-08-2024 Mr. Nishant Kumar Sinha, the learned Advocate

seeks modification of the order dated 04.08.2022

passed by this Bench in C.W.J.C. No. 7059 of 2022,

specially in the memo of parties listed in the order.

2. Respondent No. 2 has inadvertently been

shown as The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division,



Bhojpur. In fact, respondent no. 2 ought to have been the The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.

3. Let the order dated 04.08.2022 be read as one in which the respondent No. 2 is The Divisional Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna and not The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Bhojpur.

4. The order dated 04.08.2022 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 7059 of 2022 stands modified to the extent indicated above.

5. Since the writ petitioner was given the liberty to agitate against the order of cancellation of his license before the appellate authority within thirty days, which could not be done because of the wrong description of respondent No. 2, a prayer for extension of time has been sought for filing the appeal.

6. For the afore-noted reason expressed by the learned counsel, it is directed that in case an appeal is filed by the writ petitioner before the appellate authority within a period of thirty days, to be counted from today,



it shall be taken up for hearing and after affording opportunity to him and other stakeholders, if deemed necessary, the order shall be passed by the appellate authority within a further period of sixty days, giving reasons for either sustaining or revoking the order of suspension.

7. The order so passed shall be communicated to the petitioner forthwith.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

Sauravkrsinha/
Krishna-

U			
---	--	--	--

