

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16323 of 2022

=====

Gajendra Prasad Yadav @ Gajendra Yadav Son of Late Munilal Yadav,
Resident of Village- Pratap Nagar Rani, Police Station- Murliganj, District-
Madhepura. ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Patna.
 2. The Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa, Madhepura.
 3. The District Magistrate, Madhepura.
 4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Madhepura.
 5. The District Supply Officer, Madhepura.
 6. The Block Supply Officer, Madhepura. ... Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr.Uday Chand Prasad, Adv.
For the Respondents : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)

=====

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

3 11-07-2024 Heard the parties.

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

(i) For issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of order dated 22.07.2022 passed by Commissioner, Koshi Division, Saharsa in Supply Revision Case No. 12 of 2021 whereby Revision application filed by petitioner has been dismissed.

(ii) For issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing of order dated 23.02.2015 passed by Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Madhepura in P.D.S. Supply appeal Case No. 09 of 2014 whereby appeal filed by the petitioner has been rejected.

(iii) For issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for



quashing of order as contained in Memo No. 203-2 dated 05.07.2014 issued by Sub Divisional Officer, Madhepura hereby P.D.S. Licence of the petitioner bearing No. 164 of 2007 has been cancelled.

(iv) For issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus direction to Respondents to restore the P.D.S. Licence No. 164 of 2007 of the petitioner and allow him to run P.D.S.

(v) For any other relief or reliefs for that the petitioner may be found to be entitled in the facts of the case.

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, 20017. 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 be held as bad, illegal, contrary to the provisions of Rule 27(ii) of the Control Order and has to be 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 Revisional Authority dated 22.07.2022, passed in Supply Revision Case No. 12 of 2021, the order passed by the Appellate Authority dated 23.02.2015, passed in P.D.S. Supply Appeal Case No. 9 of 2014 as well as the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Sitamarhi, dated 05.07.2014, passed in P.D.S. Case No. 164 of 2007, 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 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)

Shamshad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

