

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16065 of 2017

=====

Sri Krishna Kumar Thakur Son of Late Deo Nandan Thakur, Resident of
Ward No. 7, Holding No. 19, Town P.O. P.S. and District- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Commissioner Magadh Division Gaya.
3. The District Magistrate, Aurangabad.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Aurangabad.
5. The Block Supply Officer, Aurangabad Block.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.Raza Ahmad -Aag5

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2025 1. The Writ petition is filed to direct the

Respondent-Authority to renew the PDS License
No. 33/A/T/85 of the petitioner, which was not
renewed by the concerned authorities, in spite of
paying the renewal fees.

2. The brief fact of the Writ petition is that
the petitioner made an application for Ward No. 7,
Holding No. 19, Town P.S. and District- Aurangabad
and he was granted License No. 33/A/T/85. Since



the date of grant of license, the petitioner was running the shop without any blemish from any quarter. His license was renewed up to the year 2005. Thereafter, for the period 2006 to 2008, he deposited the *challan* on 23.12.2003 as contained in Annexure-1. The petitioner again paid renewal fees on 27.12.2006 for renewal of his license from 2006 to 2008 vide Annexure 2.

3. It is the specific contention of the petitioner that he was running the PDS shop without renewal of his license but received all government supply up to 2005. However, on perusal of Annexure 1, it is evident that the challan was actually paid in the year 2004, as per the Stamp of the Government Office. Further, the Writ petition was filed in the year 2017, i.e., after a span of twelve years, for renewal of his PDS License.

4. Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned counsel for the respondents.

5. No valid or convincing reason has been



assigned by the petitioner, for inordinate delay in approaching this Court. Therefore, this Court is of the considerable view that the Writ petition was filed at a very belated stage and is not maintainable as per the law.

6. With the aforesaid observations, the Writ petition is dismissed as it is devoid of merits.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Ranjeet/-

U			
---	--	--	--

