

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11717 of 2025

Umesh Yadav Son of Ramfal Yadav Resident of Village-Nagel, P.S.-Belhar,
District -Banka (Bihar) ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, District-Banka.
3. The District Supply Officer, District-Banka.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Banka, District-Banka.
5. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Banka, District-Banka.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Belhar, District-Banka. ... Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr.Kumar Gaurav, Adv.
For the Respondents : Mr.Standing Counsel (13)

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

2 06-08-2025 Heard the parties.

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

(i) A certiorari for quashing and setting aside the order passed by the Sub Divisional Officer Banka vide Memo No.633 dated 19.05.2024 whereby and where under license of the petitioner's P.D.S shop bearing License No. 63/2012 has been cancelled on the basis of wrongly & excess quantity of food grains i.e about 20 qtl of wheat & about 83 qtl. of rice has falsely been entered & uploaded on to the petitioner's E-Pos Machine No. 122500100610 which is showing in the aforesaid machine for which neither any S.I.O has been issued nor the petitioner has received the said grains in question contained therein Annexure



-P/1 (Series), whereas above mentioned quantity of said food grains has neither been supplied to the petitioner nor received by him question. in

(ii) A Mandamus Commanding the Competent Authority to eliminate & blot out the wrongly and excess quantity of food grains i.e about 20 qtl of wheat & about 83 qtl. of Rice has falsely been entered & uploaded on to the petitioner's E-Pos Machine No. 122500100610 which is still showing in the aforesaid machine is showing but said food grains in question has neither been supplied to the petitioner nor the petitioner has never received the same.

(iii) A mandamus commanding further may kindly be directed to the competent authority to update the petitioners EPOS Machine as per the stock received by the petitioner and distribute the same amongst the beneficiaries & Further to restore the monthly allotment of the petitioner as same as before as well as also continue the monthly allotment as per the consumer tagged with the petitioners' shop as before.

(iv) Any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner may be found entitled in the fact of the present case may be granted to him.

*A photo copy of order passed by the
Sub Divisional Officer, Banka vide*



Memo No. 633 dated 19.05.204 is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure-P/1 (Series) to this writ application.

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, Banka, dated 19.05.2024, vide Memo No. 633 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. 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)

Shamshad/-

U			
---	--	--	--

