

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8567 of 2025

=====

Rina Kumari Sinha Wife of Arun Paswan Resident of Village- Dhekwaha,
P.S.- Islampur, District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer Cum Licensing Authority, Hilsa, Nalanda
5. The District Supply Officer, Nalanda.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Islampur, P.S.- Islampur, District - Nalanda

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Karna, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader 20

=====

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

2 16-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

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

“(1) Issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order contained in Memo No. 565 dated 22.07.2023 issued by the Sub Divisional Officer, Hilsa, Nalanda by which the Sub Divisional Officer, Nalanda had cancelled the Public Distribution System license of the Petitioner without providing enquiry report as conducted by the Block Supply Officer,



Islampur on the complaint contained in Letter No. 753 dated 03.05.2023 and without issuance of Notice/ service of enquiry report in connection with enquiry report contained in Letter No. 84 dated 08.05.2023 and the Licensing Authority had violated the Principle of natural justice as had neither made available the enquiry report contained in Letter No. 84 dated 08.05.2023 nor issued any Show cause Notice to the Petitioner against the enquiry report contained in Letter No. 84 dated 08.05.2023 issued by Block Supply Officer, Islampur.

(II) Issuance of further writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the appellate order dated 31.12.2024 passed in Supply Appeal No. 19/2023 by the Collector, Nalanda affirming the cancellation order without considering that the cancellation order has been itself passed in violation of the law settled by this Hon'ble Court and in violation of Principle of natural justice as neither enquiry report had been made available to the Petitioner nor issued an Show cause Notice to the Petitioner.

(III) Issuance of declaration that the impugned cancellation order contained in Memo No. 565 dated 22.07.2023 passed by the Respondent Authority is violative of law settled by this Hon'ble Court in the case of 2013(2) PLJR 637 (Md. Najibul Haque Ansari Vs. State of Bihar and Anr.) and Arun Singh Alias Arun Kumar Singh vs the State of Bihar and others



(C.W.J.C. No. 9309/2020) by which the Hon'ble Court held that the Public Distribution System license cannot be cancelled without supplying the Enquiry report to the incumbent and thus the action of the Respondent Authority is violative of Principle of natural justice.

(IV) Issuance of declaration that allegations not part of show cause notice under Clause-27 cannot be made basis for cancellation and that basing the cancellation on subsequent allegation without Show Cause Notice and service of Show Cause Notice vitiates the impugned order in view of judgment dated 14.09.2021 in C.W.J.C. No. 13613 of 2021 delivered relying upon the judgment in the case of M/s Oryx Fisheries reported in (2010) 13 SCC 427 (Para-24 to 29).

V) Issuance of further declaration that once the original order is vitiated not only all the subsequent orders are vitiated but the plea of alternative remedy is also not advisable as efficacious remedy.

(VI) Issuance of writ in nature of mandamus for a direction to the Licensing Authority to restore the Public Distribution System License No. 01/2019 forthwith and pay compensation for illegally depriving the source of livelihood by cancelling the license of the Petitioner in violation of Principle of natural justice and in violation of law settled by this Hon'ble Court.

(VII) Issuance of deceleration that



the impugned orders are bad, illegal and nonest in the eyes of law as there are series of orders of this Hon'ble Court that the PDS license cannot be cancelled without supply the enquiry report to the Petitioner and without issuance of Show cause Notice to the Petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has stated that the Sub-Divisional Officer while issuing the show cause notice to the petitioner has not enclosed the enquiry report and there is no proposal for cancellation of the license in the show-cause notice.

4. 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’)

5. Further learned counsel has relied on the judgment of this Hon’ble Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 wherein this Hon’ble Court has held that the nonsupply of the enquiry report along with the show-cause is bad and against the principle of natural justice and equity.

6. Learned counsel has further stated that petitioner has taken the above ground in the appeal, but the appellate



authority has not dealt with the above ground and dismissed the appeal in a mechanical manner.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also relied on the judgment of the Full Court 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.

8. Learned counsel has stated in view of the above mentioned provisions of law and judgments 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 also furnish a copy of the enquiry report along with the said show-cause notice and thereafter take necessary action.

9. 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 an alternative and efficacious remedy of filing a revision before the Commissioner. Learned counsel has therefore prayed this Hon'ble Court to dismiss the present writ petition.



10. This Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 held as under:

"In my opinion, irregularities in maintenance of notice board or maintenance of the stocks within the premises of the petitioner are too trivial and cannot form a basis for cancellation of licence. No doubt there were other serious charges against the petitioner regarding non-issuance of cash-memo to the consumers, distribution of lesser amount of kerosene oil and non-distribution of foodgrains but surprisingly even while making such allegations, the names of such consumers who are dissatisfied by such action of the petitioner are conspicuously missing. The allegations are sweeping in nature without reference to any specific consumer.

In my opinion the non-supply of the enquiry report conducted by the District Level Committee which is the foundation for issuance of show cause notice placed at Annexure-1 as well as non-supply of names of such of the consumers who had complained against the petitioner as regarding the irregularities in distribution of the food-grains or the kerosene oil has prejudiced the petitioner to file his purposeful reply and in absence thereof, the order impugned in my opinion, are based on no materials.

Though it was strenuously argued by Mr. Pandey that in absence of any response by



the petitioner the allegations would be deemed to have been admitted but in my opinion even if the show cause reply was missing, the orders passed by the statutory authorities having civil consequences and resulting in cancellation should reflect application of mind. Unfortunately it is grossly missing inasmuch as neither the order of the Licensing Authority nor the order of the appellate authority deal with the materials which formed the basis to drive home the charges. The orders impugned are indefensible and cannot be upheld."

11. Further 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. "

12. A perusal of the show-cause notice issued to the petitioner does not reveal that the copy of the enquiry report was enclosed along with the show-cause notice and that there is no proposal of the action sought to be taken against the petitioner.

13. 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 dated 31.12.2024 passed by the appellate authority and the order dated 22.07.2023 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub-divisional Officer (Respondent No. 4) 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 also furnish a copy of the enquiry report along with the Show Cause Notice to the petitioner and call for his explanation by giving reasonable time.

14. 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 orders strictly in accordance with law duly taking into consideration the explanation submitted by the petitioner.

15. 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.



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

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

Gauravkr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

