

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.20527 of 2018**

=====

Hanuman Prasad son of Sri Jai Narayan Yadav Resident of Village Kachada,  
P.S. Benipatti P.O. Bankatta, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar through the Secretary Food and Consumer Protection,  
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supply, Government of Bihar,  
Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga.
4. The District Magistrate, Darbhanga Division, Darbhanga.
5. The District Supply Officer, Madhubani. null null
6. The Sub Divisional Officer, Benipatti, Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjeet Kumar, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S.Raza Ahmad -AAG5

=====

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

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 11-08-2025**

1. The Writ petition is filed for the  
following reliefs:

*i) For setting aside the General  
Notice dated 15-03-2018 contained in  
Memo No. 227 dated 09-03-2015 issued  
by the District Magistrate, Madhubani for  
allotment of PDS Dealership license to  
881 licensee whereby and where under  
same has been issued in gross violation*



*of Reservation Policies issued by the government and other direction as well.*

*ii) For a direction upon the respondent authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 27-03-2018.*

*iii) For a further direction to the respondents to stop the allotment of PDS License till the final disposal of the instant case.*

*iv) For any other relief reliefs for which petitioner may be deemed entitled too.*

2. The second relief sought by the petitioner, is for consideration of his representation dated 27.03.2018, for which, the petitioner is always at liberty to approach the concerned authorities.

3. On perusal of the other reliefs, it is evident that the petitioner is seeking setting aside of the licenses already issued to 881 individuals for the PDS dealership. However, those 881 PDS dealers were not made parties to the writ petition. Therefore, the writ petition itself is not maintainable, as the said 881 licencees would be



the aggrieved parties.

4. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable.

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

Amandeep/-

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| AFR/NAFR          | NAFR       |
| CAV DATE          | N/A        |
| Uploading Date    | 12.08.2025 |
| Transmission Date |            |

