

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4964 of 2026

Manju @ Manju Pandey Wife of Suresh Chandra Pandey, Resident of Village
- Mathiya Tola, P.O.-Sahdigari, P.S.- Vijaypur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Department of Food and Civil Supply, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Bihar State Information Commission, Suchna Bhawan 4th Floor, Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Bailey road, Patna
3. The Commissioner, Gopalganj.
4. The District Collector, Gopalganj.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Hathua, District - Gopalganj.
6. The Block Supply Officer, Vijaypur, District - Gopalganj
7. The Supply Inspector, Hathua, District- Gopalganj.
8. Yoginda Devi, Wife of Sudarshan Giri, Resident of Village -Sinhpur, P.O.- Sahdigari, P.S. - Vijaypur, District - Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bijay Prakash Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Saroj Kumar Sharma, A.C. to A.A.G.-3
For the Resp. No. 2	:	Mr. Lalit Kishore, Sr. Advocate
		Ms. Binita Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 18-06-2026

None enters appearance for Respondent No. 8.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, who is aggrieved by the Public Distribution System dealer, who happens to be Respondent No. 8, who did not distribute consumer goods during the financial years 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

3. It is alleged that on account of such non-distribution, widespread corruption has taken place. It is the



case of the petitioner further that the Respondent No.8, who was appointed as a Public Distribution System dealer at Sihpur, Block- Vijaipur from the first merit-list, issued by the authority to grant Public Distribution System License had submitted forged documents in connivance with the Appointment Committee and was thereby not eligible to be a dealer.

4. Learned counsel for the State submits that the petitioner appears to have a personal issue with the respondent no.8.

5. Having given due consideration to the submissions and having perused the averments, we are of the considered view that the instant petition cannot be entertained as a Public Interest Litigation and deserves to be dismissed and disposed of.

6. The petition is accordingly dismissed and disposed of.

(Meenakshi Madan Rai, CJ)

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

shailendra/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	19.06.2026
Transmission Date	

