

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.14117 of 2023**

Prakash Lal Das @ Prahalad Lal Das, son of Sri Rashik Lal Sah, resident of Village Amba, P.S. - Shahkund, Block Shahkund, District - Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer and Protection Department Govt. of Bihar Old Secretariate, Patna - 5.
2. The Divisional Commissioner Bhagalpur Division, At Bhagalpur.
3. The Collector, Bhagalpur at Bhagalpur.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Sadar Bhagalpur.
5. Block Supply Officer, Block, Shahkund District Bhagalpur.
6. The District Supply Officer Bhagalpur.
7. Block Supply Officer, Goradih, Prakhand.

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Akhilesh Kumar Sinha, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad (AAG 5)

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A. ABHISHEK REDDY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

6      10-03-2026

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following relief(s):-

*“(A) For quashing and setting aside the order dated 25-09-2018 (Annexure-9) passed by the Sub Divisional Officer, Bhagalpur Sadar (respondent No. 4) illegally cancelling the P.D.S. licence No. 01/92 (Old) and 27/2016 (New) on the basis of a callous enquiry report dated 27-10-2015 and in contravention of the direction of the Collector Appellate Authority Bhagalpur given to him in P.D.S. Appeal No.*



*180/20116-17 on 20-04-2018*

*(B) For Quashing the order dated 2021 28-10- (Anenxure-11) passed by the Collector-Cum-Appellate Authority Bhagalpur illegally, (respondent No. 3), the appeal dismissing petition of the petitioner in P.D.S. appeal petition of the petitioner in P.D.S. appeal case No. 372/2018-19 without going in to the merit and valid evidence produced by the appellant.*

*(C) For quashing and setting aside the order dated 18-04-2023 (Anenxure-12) passed by the Divisional Commissioner, Bhagalpur, (respondent No. 2) illegally rejecting the revision petition of the petitioner in supply revision No. 6 /2022-23 (Prakash Lal Das Vrs The State of Bihar And others) without examining the legal issue involved and even after submission of sufficient and valid evidence produced by the petitioner before him. Hence, all the above orders are fit to be set aside with cost.*

*(D) For issuance of a writ any appropriate writ application or order/direction commanding the respondent authority his to restore the licence and permit him to run the shop as usual.*

*(E) To issue any other order/ direction for which the petitioner is entitled for.”*

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has stated that the Sub-Divisional Officer while



issuing the show cause notice to the petitioner has not enclosed the enquiry report.

4. Further learned counsel has relied on the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 wherein this Hon'ble Court has held that the non-supply of the enquiry report along with the show-cause is bad and against the principle of natural justice and equity.

5. Learned counsel has stated that in view of the above mentioned provisions of law and judgment relied by the petitioner, the impugned order may be set aside and matter remanded back to the authorities concerned for furnishing a copy of the enquiry report and any other material that they seek to rely on and give an opportunity of filing his explanation and thereafter take necessary action.

6. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents has vehemently opposed the very maintainability of the writ petition. Learned counsel has therefore prayed this Hon'ble Court to dismiss the present writ petition.

7. This Court in CWJC No.253 of 2014 dated 11.03.2015 held as under:

"In my opinion, irregularities in maintenance of notice board or maintenance of the stocks



within the premises of the petitioner are too trivial and cannot form a basis for cancellation of licence. No doubt there were other serious charges against the petitioner regarding non-issuance of cash-memo to the consumers, distribution of lesser amount of kerosene oil and non-distribution of food-grains but surprisingly even while making such allegations, the names of such consumers who are dissatisfied by such action of the petitioner are conspicuously missing. The allegations are sweeping in nature without reference to any specific consumer.

In my opinion the non-supply of the enquiry report conducted by the District Level Committee which is the foundation for issuance of show cause notice placed at Annexure-1 as well as non-supply of names of such of the consumers who had complained against the petitioner as regarding the irregularities in distribution of the food-grains or the kerosene oil has prejudiced the petitioner to file his purposeful reply and in absence thereof, the order impugned in my opinion, are based on no materials.

Though it was strenuously argued by Mr. Pandey that in absence of any response by the petitioner the allegations would be deemed to have been admitted but in my opinion even if the show cause reply was missing, the orders passed by the statutory authorities having civil consequences and resulting in cancellation should reflect application of mind. Unfortunately it is grossly missing inasmuch as neither the order of the Licensing Authority nor the order of the appellate authority deal with the materials which formed the basis to drive home the charges. The orders impugned are indefensible and



cannot be upheld."

8. A perusal of the show-cause notice issued to the petitioner does not reveal that the copy of the enquiry report was enclosed along with the show-cause notice.

9. Having regard to the above facts and circumstances and the law laid down by this Hon'ble Court, the present CWJC is allowed. The impugned orders dated 18.04.2023, 28.10.2021 and 25.09.2018 passed by the Divisional Commissioner, the District Magistrate and the Sub-Divisional Officer, respectively, are set aside. The matter is remanded back to the Sub-Divisional Officer (Respondent No. 4) for furnishing a copy of the enquiry report as well as the statement made by any of the complainants and any other material relied on the petitioner and call for his explanation by giving reasonable time.

10. On such show-cause notice being served, the petitioner shall file his explanation within the stipulated time. On receipt of the explanation submitted by the petitioner the authority concerned shall pass a reasoned order strictly in accordance with law duly taking into consideration the explanation submitted by the petitioner.

11. It is needless to mention that before passing any order, the petitioner shall be given an opportunity of hearing.



The entire exercise shall be completed as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Any order passed shall be communicated to the petitioner.

12. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is allowed to the extent indicated above.

**(A. Abhishek Reddy , J)**

Bhardwaj/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

