

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12719 of 2017

=====

Md. Imraj Rashid Son of Late Harun Rashid, Resident of Village- Marar
Dakshin, P.O.- Marar, P.S.- Morkahi, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Additional Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
3. The Collector, Khagaria, District- Khagaria.
4. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Khagaria, District- Khagaria.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Kumar Labh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal-Sc4

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 14-05-2025

1. Initially the Writ petition was filed with a prayer to quash the circular issued by the State of Bihar, Food and Consumer Protection Department of the Additional Secretary, vide Memo No. Pra 07-Misc.-16/2015-1222 dated 08.03.2017, whereby it was stated to all the regional Commissioner/all the District Magistrates to make roaster under provision



of Bihar Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2016 and the provision of General Administration Department in which 35% reservation for women has been logically and practically allowed under the circular No. 2342 dated 15.02.2016 and to start action for issuance of new PDS license after publishing advertisement in leading newspapers and informed the same as soon as possible as well as quashing the vacancy published by the Collector, Khagaria in daily newspaper dated 12.05.2017 for the same as contained in Annexure-1 and accordingly direct the respondents not to issue fresh PDS license within the Marar Dakshni Panchayat in the block and district of Khagaria till final order of this Court and further to direct the licensing authority to dispose of the application filed by the petitioner in the year 2015.



2. During the course of argument, the Learned counsel for the petitioner reported that he is not pressing for the entire relief and only prays for the relief which is as follows:-

Further to direct the licensing authority to dispose of the application filed by the petitioner in the year 2015.

3. The Learned counsel for the petitioner has also made an endorsement that he is not pressing the entire prayer. The limited aspect which is to be decided by this Court is that whether the application of the petitioner, filed in the year 2015 is still pending with the respondent authorities or not ?

4. At this juncture, the Learned counsel for the respondent contended that the direction may be given to the licensing authority, to dispose of the application if at all it is pending. Further it is contended by the Learned counsel for the



respondents that the petitioner shall make a fresh representation before the authority, for which a reasonable order can be passed by the respondents.

5. In view of the submissions, this Court directs the petitioner to make a fresh representation before the concerned authority within a period of one month from the date of receipt of this order, along with the order copy and in turn, the respondents shall pass a reasonable order within two months from the date of filing of the representation.

6. With the aforesaid observation, the Writ petition is disposed of.

7. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall also disposed of.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

amitkr/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	15.05.2025
Transmission Date	N/A

