

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.767 of 2024

=====

Md. Hatim Miyan, Son of Diljan Miyan ,Resident of Ragunathpur, ward no.-
9 Panditpur alias Bandarhelwa, P.S.- Areraj, East Champaran, Motihari.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Muzaffarpur.
3. The District Magistrate, East Champaran Motihari.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer Areraj, East Champaran Motihari.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kr. Mishra, Adv. Mr. Manini Jaiswal, Adv. Ms. Komal Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Pleader (25)

=====

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

4 03-05-2024 Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

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

“i. For quashing the Order dated 12.10.2023 passed in Appeal no. 25/2021-22 passed by Collector cum District Magistrate East Champaran, Motihari whereby and where under appeal preferred by the petitioner has been rejected.

ii. For quashing the order dated 29.07.2022 passed in PDS appeal no. 25/2021-22 whereby and where under the Respondent District Magistrate has rejected the appeal upheld the order dated 19.02.2020 passed by the Sub Divisional officer, Areraj.

iii. For quashing the order contained in memo no 446 dated 18.11.2020 issued under the signature of respondent no 3 whereby and where the earlier order of cancellation



was up held and the license of the petitioner has been cancelled.

iv. For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the order contained in memo no. 30 dated 19.02.2020 passed by Respondent no. 3 by which the license no 40/2016 of the petitioner under public distribution system was cancelled.

V. And the petitioner further prays to restore the license no. 40/2016 of the petitioner forthwith.”

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 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 orders dated 29.07.2022 and 12.10.2023 passed by the Appellate Authority as well as the order dated 18.01.2020 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Areraj, East Champaran, Motihari 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)

Bhardwaj/-

U			
---	--	--	--

