

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.964 of 2026

=====

Jitendra Kumar Son of Late Sonalal Chaudhary, Resident of Village-Jitpur,
P.S - Chauradano, District - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Raxaul, East Champaran.
4. The District Supply Officer, East Champaran.
5. The Block Supply Officer, Chauradano Block, East Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar @Maurya,
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Gyan Prakash Ojha, GA (7)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 23-07-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

petitioner and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

2. With the consent of both the parties, this writ
application is being disposed of at the admission stage itself.

3. In the present writ application, the petitioner has
prayed for grant of following reliefs:-

*“i. Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction,
including a writ of mandamus, commanding the
respondent authorities to grant PDS licence in
favour of the petitioner in terms of the
petitioner’s valid selection made by the District
Selection Committee vide Memo No. 1027 dated
05.11.2024.*

*ii. Issue a writ of certiorari for quashing the
decision of the District Selection Committee
dated 15.04.2025, whereby the petitioner’s
lawful claim was rejected on the basis of*



fabricated and mala fide reports submitted by the Block Supply Officer and Sub-Divisional Officer, Raxaul.

iii. Direct the respondents to consider and dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 19.08.2025 within a fixed time frame.

iv. Issue a writ or direction restraining the respondents from granting the said PDS shop to any third party during pendency of the writ petition.

v. Pass such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

4. At the outset, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that there is an alternative and efficacious remedy available to the petitioner. Despite the remedy available to the petitioner to file a revision application before the Commissioner, Tirhut Division in terms of amendment order of Bihar Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Second Amendment Order, 2022 against the decision of the District Level Compassionate Appointment Committee, East Champaran, the petitioner has approached this Court without availing the alternative and efficacious remedy available to him.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that he may be permitted to file revision before the concerned authority in terms of amendment order of Bihar Targeted Public



Distribution System (Control), and a direction may be issued to the concerned authority to decide the revision within a reasonable time frame in accordance with law.

6. Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has an alternative remedy for filing revision, this writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file a revision before the Commissioner, Tirhut Division within fifteen (15) days from today and if such a revision is filed within the stipulated time then the Commissioner, Tirhut Division is directed to dispose of the same within a period of three months from the date of filing of the revision, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

7. Needless to emphasize that the final order which shall be passed by the Commissioner, Tirhut Division should be a reasoned and speaking order.

8. With the aforesaid observation/direction and liberty granted, this writ application is disposed of.

9. All pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall also stand.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

nitv/-

U			
---	--	--	--

