

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.21681 of 2019

Manju Devi @ Manjoo Devi, W/o Ravin Ravindra Kumar Ravi, Resident of Village- Amahara, P.S.- Bihta, Dist- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the District Magistrate, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The SDO, Danapur, Patna.
4. The Block Supply Officer Bihta, Distt. Patna.
5. Smt. Chandani Kumari, W/o Shri Ramesh Kumar, Resident of Village- Amahara, P.S. Bihta, Distt. Patna.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dineshwar Mishra
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad, AAG5

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA CHAKRAVARTHY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 23-06-2026

1. The Writ petition is filed for the fol-

lowing reliefs:

“For issuance of appropriate Writ (s), order (s) or direction Commanding the respondents to appoint/select the petitioner as PDS Dealer and accordingly for issuance of PDS Licence in her favour in Amahar Panchayat under Bihta PS within the district of Patna and for cancellation of the PDS Licence of the Respondent No. 5 as a member of her family has already been accorded PDS Licence in ward No. 7 of the same panchayat as such the act of the Respondent authority in issuance of PDS Licence to the Respondent No. 5 is illegal, high handed and arbitrary in nature and the same is also without Jurisdiction



and has offended the fundamental right of the petitioner conferred under article 16 and 21 of the constitution of India.”

2. At this juncture, the Learned counsel for the respondents contended that Section 32(vi) of the Bihar Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2016 provides for the provision of revision. Section 32(v) and (vi) read as follows:

“32. (v) Till the disposal of appeal pending, the Appellate Authority may direct that the order under appeal shall not take effect for such period as the authority may consider necessary for giving a reasonable opportunity to the other party under sub-clause (4) or until the appeal is disposed of, whichever is earlier.

(vi) Due to non disposal of the appeal within sixty days by the District Officer or against the order passed in the appeal, a revision may be filed before the Divisional Commissioner. The revision shall be disposed of within two months.”

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that he intends to file a revision before the Divisional Commissioner, but the limitation period for filing the revision has lapsed. He prayed for a direction to the concerned Divisional Commis-



sioner to entertain the revision petition in accordance with Section 5 of the Limitation Act.

4. Taking into consideration that the petitioner has an alternative remedy for filing a revision, the Writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file the revision petition within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order before the Divisional Commissioner. The delay in filing the revision shall be condoned by the Divisional Commissioner, and the authority shall dispose of the revision within three months from the date of filing of the revision petition.

5. With the above said observation, the Writ petition is disposed of.

6. Interlocutory Application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Shanu/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	NA

