

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.15760 of 2023

Arvind Kumar Paswan Son of Achhe Lal Paswan, Resident of Ward No. 12
Bathua Bujurg Sihma Bathua Bujurg, Police Station- Bathua Bujurg,
Samastipur- 848127, Bihar ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Protection, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Samastipur.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, cum Licensing Officer, Sarairanjan, Samastipur.
4. The Block Supply Officer, Sarairanjan, Samastipur. ... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anand Kumar Ojha, Adv.
For the Respondents : Mr. Anisul Haque, AC to AAG V

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

2 10-12-2024 Heard the parties.

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

“..... for quashing the show cause notices contained in Memo No. 719 dated 18.05.2023 along with Show Cause Notice contained in Memo No. 862 dated 20.06.2023 as well as quashing of the order of cancellation contained in Memo No 1208 dated 16.09.2023 on the ground that without supplying the enquiry report/Copy of Complaint/ Materials mentioned in the Show Cause and upon vague allegations as also allegations connected with Notice Board or Stock/ Distribution register is violative of Clause 27(ii) of Control Order 2016. The petitioner prays for a direction to the Respondents not to take coercive steps for Bodging F.I.R. or any other action and also for a direction to restore the license.”

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. The petitioner having



exhausted all the remedies has approached this Court by way of this present CWJC that all the authorities have found that the petitioner has violated the provisions of the Control Order, 2016. That the said finding of fact arrived by all the authorities cannot be interpreted by this Hon'ble Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. 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 licensee 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 Sub-Divisional Officer-cum-Licensing Officer, Sarairanjan, Samastipur, vide Memo No. 1208 dated 16.09.2023 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. The authorities before issuing any notice shall duly take into consideration the fact that First Information Report (FIR) has been lodged against the petitioner under Section 7 of the Essential Commodities Act and the petitioner has already obtained bail under Section 28 of the Control Order, 2016.

12. 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.

13. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is **allowed** to the extent indicated above.

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

Shamshad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

