

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3052 of 2026

=====

Uday Kumar Son of Ganesh Prasad Sah, Resident of village- Dharampur,
P.S.- Minapur, District- Muzaffarpur- 843117.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Chairman, State Level Committee for Wood- Based Industries-cum-Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Department of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Licensing Officer-Cum-Divisional Forest Officer, Tirhut Forest Division, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Mistry, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General (3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 30-04-2026 Heard Mr. Vinay Mistry, learned counsel for the

petitioner and the State.

2. The present petition has been preferred for the
following relief(s):

*“i) For issuance of a writ in the nature
of quashing of the Order bearing Memo No. 1563
dated 22.07.2025 (Annexure-P-4) passed by the
Licensing Officer-cum-Divisional Forest Officer,
Tirhut Forest Division, Muzaffarpur whereby the
License of the petitioner bearing License No. 359
of 1995 has been cancelled simply on the ground*



that the renewal of license was not submitted as the aforesaid order has been passed without hearing to the petitioner under the provisions of Bihar Wood Based Industries (Establishment and Regulation) Act, 2025.

ii) For issuance of a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the Respondent No. 3- Licensing Officer-cum-Divisional Forest Officer, Tirhut Forest Division, Muzaffarpur to dispose of the petition dated 08.01.2026 (Annexure-P-6) filed by the petitioner for recall of the order bearing Memo No. 1563 dated 22.07.2025 and further to renew the license bearing License No. 359 of 1995 on the basis of deposit of entire renewal fee in the prescribed format for the year 2000-2026 dated 08.01.2026 in view of the decision of SCL dated 14.01.2025 (Annexure-P-3) in the facts and circumstances of this case.

iii). For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents not to interfere with the operation of saw mill in the facts and circumstances of this case.”



3. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has already preferred a representation before the appellate authority which may be directed to be taken to its logical conclusion.

4. Learned State counsel has no objection to it.

5. In that background, the writ petition stands disposed of allowing the petitioner to pursue his representation and the respondents are directed to dispose it of at an earliest.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Adnan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

