

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17642 of 2019**

=====

Niraj Sharma Son of Baban Sharma Resident of Village-Odhbigha, Police Station-Banshi in the District of Arwal.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supply, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supply, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gaya.
4. The District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Arwal,
5. The District Supply Officer, Arwal
6. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Arwal
7. The Block Marketing Officer, Banshi, in the District of Arwal.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.Raza Ahmad (AAG-5)

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2      16-10-2025                      **1.** The Writ petition has been filed to direct the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for the grant of PDS Licence to run the PDS Shop at village-Odhbigha under Sonbhadra Gram Panchayat in the District of Arwal, as the petitioner had applied for the PDS Licence in the year, 2006.

**2.** The brief facts culled of the Writ petition is that the petitioner came to know about one



vacancy for a PDS dealer in Sonbhadra Gram Panchayat under Banshi Block in the District of Arwal. Accordingly, he applied to grant PDS licence to run the PDS Shop.

**3.** It is contended that the application was submitted by the petitioner to the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Arwal to direct the Block Marketing/ Supply Officer to conduct inquiry with respect to the arrest of the petitioner. Pursuant to the directions of the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent, an inquiry was held and a report was submitted stating that the petitioner fulfills the eligibility . However, the matter is still pending and no order has been passed. Being aggrieved by the same, the present Writ petition has been filed.

**4.** On the other hand, the Learned counsel for the respondents contended that no advertisement was issued for the said vacancy and in the inquiry report also, no vacancy had been reported, and that the petitioner has no right over the said vacancy. Therefore, prayed to dispose of the Writ petition.



**5.** Heard the Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the Learned counsel for the respondents.

**6.** After considering the rival contentions and submissions made by both parties, it is evident that no vacancies were notified by the concerned authority. However, the application filed by the petitioner is still pending before respondent No. 6. Therefore, the respondent No. 6 is directed to pass appropriate orders on the application of the petitioner's in accordance with law.

**7.** With the aforesaid observations, the Writ petition is disposed of.

**(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)**

Manish/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

