

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13960 of 2023

=====

Arun Kumar Ram Son of Late Hira Lal Ram Resident of Village- Fulkaha,
Ward No. -19, Panchayat and P.S. Jadia, Block- Triveniganj, District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supplies Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector cum Chairman, District Selection Committee, Supaul.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Triveniganj, District- Supaul.
5. The District Supply Officer, Supaul.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Block- Triveniganj, District- Supaul.
7. The Additional Collector, Supaul.
8. Asmita Kumari, W/o- Deep Narayan Ram Resident of Village- Fulkaha, Panchayat and P.S Jadia, Block- Triveniganj, District- Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate
	:	Md. Nematullah, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC-4

=====

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

10 26-06-2025

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has stated that the District Selection Committee pursuant to the advertisement issued for selection of the PDS Dealer has selected the respondent no.8. However, the respondent no.8 subsequently has withdrawn the application solely on the ground that she has selected as an *Anganwari Sevika*.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has stated that as per the merit list prepared by the authority, the petitioner



was standing at serial no.1 whereas the respondent no.8 was at serial no. 3. Learned counsel has stated that once the respondent no.8 has withdrawn her candidature, the authority is duty bound to select the petitioner but they have failed to do so. Learned counsel has stated that though the petitioner has filed the petition before the revisional authority, the revisional authority has also not considered the issue at a proper perspective duly taking into consideration the provisions of the Control Order more particularly provision 9(v) of the same.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner has stated that the only qualification required for appointment of a PDS Dealer is that the applicant should be a matric pass and in case there are more than two persons, the person having computer knowledge should be selected and in case of both persons having computer knowledge, the older one will be appointed as a PDS Dealer. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, therefore, prays to set aside the impugned order by allowing the present writ petition.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-state has stated that the petitioner may be directed to give a suitable representation to the district magistrate (respondent no.3) who is the chairman of the District Selection Committee and a direction



may be given to consider the said representation of the petitioner.

6. Having regard to the same, the present writ petition is disposed of directing the petitioner to give a suitable representation ventilating his grievance before the District Magistrate (respondent no.3) within a period of four weeks from today. On such representation being given, the authority shall consider the same duly taking into account the provisions of Rule 9(v) of the Control Order as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of 8 weeks from the date of filing of the representation from the petitioner. It is needless to say that before passing any order, the petitioner shall be granted an opportunity of hearing. Any order passed shall be communicated to the parties.

7. With the above direction, the writ petition stands disposed of.

(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)

ajay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

