



104

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-25825-2025

Date of decision: 09.09.2025

PURAN SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Tejinder Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioners.
(Through Video Conferencing)

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to cancel the licence of depot holder, namely, Harjeet Kaur and to allot the same to some new and honest depot holder for supply of ration to the villagers, with a further prayer to direct the respondents to tag the supply of ration of petitioners to the depot of depot holder, namely, Mukhtiar Singh.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has joined the proceedings through video conferencing and submitted that the prayer of the petitioners in the present petition is two-fold. The first prayer is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to cancel the licence of respondent No.4-depot holder, namely, Harjeet Kaur on account of various



irregularities committed by her and the second prayer is for a direction to the respondents to tag the supply of ration of the petitioners to some other depot holder, namely, Mukhtiar Singh in view of the fact that supply to respondent No.4 stands suspended from 16.01.2025 and there is no distribution of ration and therefore, the depot may be attached with some other depot holder.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submitted that respondent No.4-depot holder has committed various irregularities on the basis of which the licence granted to her was suspended and therefore, a direction may be issued to the respondents to cancel her depot licence. He also submitted that since the supply of ration to the petitioners and other villagers has been suspended because of suspension of supplies to respondent No.4, the said depot may be attached to some other depot holder, namely, Mukhtiar Singh so as to ensure that the supply of ration is maintained.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, Addl. A.G, Punjab submitted on instructions from Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Inspector, District Food and Civil Supplies Department, Ferozepur, who is present in the Court, that so far as suspension of supplies to respondent No.4-depot holder is concerned, which was ordered on 16.01.2025, the same has now been directed to be restored and in this way, the suspension stands revoked and therefore, the second prayer made by the petitioners is unfounded and it has become redundant. He further submitted that so far as the first prayer of the petitioners seeking a direction to the respondents to cancel the licence of respondent No.4 is concerned, the same is not maintainable as it is for the Department of Food and Civil Supplies to consider as to whether licence of respondent No.4 has to be cancelled or not. He



further submitted on instructions that all the proceedings against respondent No.4 have been dropped since no irregularity was found qua her and therefore, the first prayer is not maintainable.

5. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

6. So far as the second prayer made by the petitioners seeking to attach the depot of respondent No.4 to some other depot holder, namely, Mukhtiar Singh is concerned, the same has become redundant in view of the fact that as per the learned State counsel, on instructions from the official who is present in the Court, supplies have been restored to respondent No.4. So far as the first prayer made by the petitioners seeking a direction to cancel the licence of respondent No.4 is concerned, the same has also become redundant in view of the submissions made by the learned State counsel on instructions that the proceedings against respondent No.4 have been dropped. In this way, the petitioners cannot seek a writ in the nature of *mandamus* from this Court for cancellation of depot licence of respondent No.4 on the basis of allegations against her.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, nothing would survive in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed. However, the dismissal of this petition would not mean that the petitioners are debarred from making any complaint against respondent No.4 in future.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

09.09.2025
Chetan Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No