

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13374 of 2025

=====

Madan Kumar Singh @ Madan Singh Son of Parikshan Singh Resident of
Village Chhoti Marai, Yusufpur, P.S.-Hajipur Town, District-Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut
3. The District Magistrate, District-Vaishali.
4. The District Supply Officer, District-Vaishali.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Hajipur, District-Vaishali.
6. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Hajipur, Vaishali.
7. The Marketing Officer, Hajipur Sadar, Vaishali.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Gaurav
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Government Pleader (27)

=====

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

2 23-09-2025 Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

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

“I. For quashing and setting aside order passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, Hajipur vide Memo No. 862 dated 10.10.2018 whereby and where under license of the petitioner P.D.S. Shop bearing License No. 37/2007 has been cancelled contained therein (Annexure P4 series) on the basis of some general, ominous, false and self manufactured allegations have levelled against him prejudicially & purely with malafide intention which is beyond the truth and fact of this matter as well as also



quashing an setting aside the order dated 21.01.2021 passed by learned Collector cum District Magistrate, Vaishali in PDS Appeal Case No. 95/18-19 contained therein (Annexure P/5 series) whereby & where under appeal filed by the petitioner against the cancellation order has been rejected without considering the legal merit of this case & also quashing and setting aside the order dated 15.04.2024 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut in PDS Supply Revision Case No. 79/2024 contained therein (Annexure P/6 series) whereby and where under the revision filed by the petitioner against the appellate order has also been rejected without considering the merit & fact of the case.

II. For commanding the respondent i.e. S.D.O., Hajipur to restore the petitioner's P.D.S. shop license bearing license No. 37/2007 and consumers of the petitioner's shop like before and to make the allotment for the same as before.

III. Any other relief or reliefs for which the petitioner may be found entitled in the fact and circumstances of the present case may be granted to him ”

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 that 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 as the petitioner has exhausted all the remedies and all the authorities have found that the petitioner has violated the provisions of the Control Order, 2016. 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 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. ”

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 held as bad, illegal, contrary to the provisions of Rule 27(ii) of the Control Order and has to 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 dated 15.04.2024 passed by the Revisional Authority I.e, the Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut the, appellate order dated 21.01.2021 passed by the Collector -cum- the District Magistrate Vaishali and the order dated 10.10.2018 passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, Hajipur are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub-divisional Officer, Hajipur 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)

sunilkumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

