

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.518 of 2022**

=====

Sundeeep Kumar Singh Son of Jay Prakash Singh Resident of Noorpur Katra  
Bazar, P.S.- Mal Salami, Sub-Division, Patna City, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer Patna City.
6. The Marketing Office Patna City, Ward No. 72
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO) Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 541 of 2022**

=====

Rajeev Kumar Son of Manna Lal Resident of Choti Nagla, P.S.- Malsalami,  
Sub- Division, Patna City, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer, Patna City, Ward no. 70.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 562 of 2022**

=====

Binod Kumar Singh Son of Tipan Singh Resident of Village and P.O. -  
Sabalpur, P.S. - Deedarganj, Sub- division, Patna City, District- Patna, At  
present Shyampath Gali No. 10, Chandmari Road, Kankarbagh, Post-  
Lohiyanagar, P.S. - Kankarbagh, Patna.



... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub - Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Office, Patna City, Ward 72 FA.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 597 of 2022**

Bindi Devi Wife of Ram Sujit Kumar, Resident of Village-Mahamdapur, P.O.- Kothiya, P.S.-Deedarganj, Sub-Divisional, Patna City, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer, Patna City, Ward no. 72.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 640 of 2022**

Ratna Kumari Wife of Sujit Kumar Resident of Sabalpur, P.S.- Deedarganj, Sub-Division, Patna City, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.



4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Office, Patna City, Ward 72FA.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 692 of 2022**

=====

New Anupam Mahila Sahkari Upbhokta Bhandar Ltd. Through its Secretary namely Sharda Devi (Female), aged about 56 years, Wife of Ram Parvesh Singh, Resident of Village- Raibagh, P.O.- Kachchidargah, P.S.- Deedarganj, Sub- Division, Patna City, District- Patna, Shop Address- Mohalla Deedarganj, P.O.- Bazar Samiti, P.S.- Deedarganj, Ward 72, Block Patna City. At present House No. 262 MIG Colony Kankarbagh, Post- Lohiyanagar, P.S.- Kankarbagh, Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer Patna City, Ward No. 72.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO) Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 710 of 2022**

=====

Raj Kumar son of Late Deo Narayan Singh, resident of Village-Khaspur, Panchayat Sonawan, P.S. Didarganj, Patna City, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Licensing Authority-cum-Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City, District-Patna.
4. The Block Supply Officer-cum-Supply Inspector, Block-Patna City, District-Patna.



... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 908 of 2022**

Kamla Devi Wife of Prahlad Prasad, Resident of Devi Asthan, Didarganj, Sabalpur, Patna Rural, P.S. - Deedarganj, Sub-Division, Patna City, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Office, Patna City, Ward 72FA.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 957 of 2022**

Ram Babu Singh Son of Late Shiv Balak Singh Resident of Village-Alampur, Sabalpur, P.S. Didarganj, Patna. District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principoal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector-Cum-District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Patna City
4. The Licensing Authority-Cum-Sub Divisional Officer, Block-Patna City, District-Patna.
5. The Block Supply Officer-Cum-Supply Inspector, Block-Patna City, District-Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1224 of 2022**

Kameshwar Prasad Son of Jhamei Prasad, Resident of Village - Nuruddin Ganj, P.O. - Mahadev Mills, Simili Murarpur, P.S. Didarganj, District - Patna.



... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector - Cum - District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Patna City.
4. The Licensing Authority - Cum - Sub Divisional Officer, Block - Patna City, District - Patna.
5. The Block Supply Officer - Cum - Supply Inspector, Block - Patna City, District - Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1416 of 2022**

Smt. Srishti Sagar D/o Ramanand Prasad Resident of Pather Ki Masjid Secretary Corporative Consumer Store Limited Pather ki Masjid, Patna, License Holder (PDS) No. 56/2016.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt, of Bihar, Patna
3. The Deputy Director Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer, Patna City, Ward 51.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1554 of 2022**

Premshila Devi D/o Ramanand Prasad, House No. 30/24 Patthar Ki Masjid Tekari Road Patna, Proprietor is Dealer Fair Price Shop (PDs) (Public Control Shop), Licence No. 52/2016.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.



3. The Deputy Director Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer, Patna City, Ward 51.
7. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1856 of 2022**

=====

Mohammad Muslim Ansari Son of Late Mohamamd Ismail, Resident of  
Vilalge Khan Mirza, P.S. Sultanganj, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, department of Food and Civil Supplies, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate-Cum-Collector, Patna.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Patna City, District-Patna.
5. The Marketing Officer, Patna City, Ward No. 51, District-Patna.
6. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City, District-Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2050 of 2022**

=====

Birendra Prasad Singh S/o Rameshlok Singh, R/o Village-Bararpur, P.O.-  
Kacchi Dargah, P.S.Didarganj, Patna City, District-Patna-803201.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Food, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City.
6. The Marketing Officer, Patna City.
7. The District Supply Officer, Patna.
8. The Assistant District Supply Officer (ADSO), Patna City.



... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3359 of 2022**

Kallu Manjhi Son of Indradev Manjhi Resident of Village-Shekhapura, P.S.-  
Amnaur, District-Saran (Chapra).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Protection, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department of Food and Consumer Protection, Government of Bihar, Patna
3. The Commissioner Saran Division Chapra
4. The District Magistrate, Saran (Chapra)
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer Marhaura, Saran (Chapra).
6. The Assistant District Supply Officer Marhaura, Saran (Chapra).
7. The Block Supply Officer, Amnaur, Saran (Chapra).

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3455 of 2022**

Ram Pravin Singh S/o- Bhagvat Singh Resident of Village- Raybag, P.S.-  
Fatuha, District- Patna, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principle Secretary, Food and Consumer Protection Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City.
4. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Patna City.
5. The Block Supply Officer, Patna City.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4042 of 2022**

Rajesh Kumar Son of Shyambau Prasad Resident of Alampur, Jethuli, Kachi  
Dargah, P.S.-Didarganj, Patna City, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s



Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supply, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Patna.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City, Patna.
4. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Patna City, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4043 of 2022**

Satish Kumar Son of Ramjee Singh, Resident of Village and P.O. - Kothiya, P.S. - Didarganj, Mirchak Kotihya, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Food and Civil Supply Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Collector, Patna.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Patna City, Patna.
4. The Assistant District Supply Officer, Patna City, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 518 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 541 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jitendra Singh, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Upendra Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 562 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 597 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV

(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 640 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.





For the Respondent/s : Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 692 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)  
 Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 710 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kr. Sinha, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr.Bhola Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
 Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC4  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 908 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr. Upendra Pd. Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Suresh Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
 Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 957 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kr. Sinha, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr.Bhola Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC4  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1224 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kr. Sinha, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr.Bhola Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 Mr. Upendra Pratap Singh, AC to SC4  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1416 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Upendra Prasad Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Kameshwar Singh, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc 4)  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1554 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Upendra Prasad Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Kameshwar Singh, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
 Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 1856 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Upendra Prasad Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Kameshwar Singh, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 2050 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Lakshman Lal Pandey, Adv.  
 Mr. Abhishekh Kumar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. Raza Ahmad, AAG V  
 Mr. Alok Ranjan, AC to AAGV  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3359 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anand Kumar Ojha, Adv.  
 Mr.Ram Kishore Singh, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad (AAG5)  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 3455 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Adv.  
 Ms. Preety Kunwar, Adv.  
 For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal ( Sc 4)  
 (In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4042 of 2022)  
 For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjeet Kumar, Adv.



Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Ayush Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.S. Raza Ahmad (Aag5)  
(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 4043 of 2022)  
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjeet Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Ayush Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Kanishk Kaustubh, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Arvind Ujjwal (Sc4)

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR**  
**and**  
**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN**  
**ORAL JUDGMENT**  
**(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR)**

**Date : 18-05-2022**

All these writ petitions have been heard together and a common order is being passed.

In all these writ petitions, the major challenge is to the contents of the notice which does not give any idea to the noticees/petitioners that in case their show-cause reply is not found to be satisfactory, what action shall be taken against them.

The notice specifically states that in case no response of the noticees are received by the licensing authority, an ex-parte order shall be passed under the provisions of the National Food Security Act, 2013.

Mr. Jitendra Singh, learned senior advocate, leading the arguments in all these cases, has submitted that in the event of notice being defective, the entire proceeding would be vitiated and the noticees/petitioners would not be required to assail the order canceling their license. He has further drawn attention of this



Court to the provisions contained in Clause 27 of the Bihar Targeted P.D.S. (Control) Order, 2016 which mandates that no order of cancellation of a license shall be made until the licensee has been given sufficient opportunity to state his case against the proposal of cancellation of his license.

To supplement his arguments, Mr. Singh has drawn the attention of this Court towards a judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in UMC Technologies Private Limited Vs. Food Corporation of India and another in which the requirements of a notice for any further action against the noticee has been dealt with.

The aforesaid judgment, taking into account the verdict of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Gorkha Security Services Vs. Govt. of NCT of Delhi and others, (2014) 9 SCC 105, has held that in any notice, the requirement of stating the action which is proposed to be taken is very important. The fundamental purpose behind serving the show-cause notice is to make the noticee understand the precise case set up against him, which he has to meet. This has been further elaborated upon by holding that a noticee would also be entitled to know about the proposed action which would be warranted in case the action of the noticee was found to be deficient or his explanation to be unsatisfactory.



However, a caution was also sounded that even if the proposed action is not specifically mentioned in the show-cause notice but, the same can clearly and safely be discerned from reading thereof, the requirements of proper contents of the notice would be satisfied.

It has been alleged on behalf of the State that from the bare perusal of the notice, it would appear that on a decision by the Secretary of the Department of Food and Civil Supplies, an enquiry was constituted against the noticees/petitioners and on submission of the report of such enquiry, the petitioners were noticed to explain their cause; but, in such notice, they have only been intimated that if they do not respond to the notice or their explanation is found to be unsatisfactory, they will be proceeded under the National Food Security Act, 2013.

Notwithstanding the aforesaid unhappy drafting of the notice, it has been suggested by the learned counsel for the State that the noticees cannot be proceeded against under the National Food Security Act, 2013 as the penalty provided therein is meant for the officers of the Department and not for the licensees under the Control Order of 2016. It has further been argued that in the background of the fact that the petitioners have responded to the notice and have been afforded all opportunity to explain their



cause, no fault should be found with the notice at the threshold stage and the merits of the order canceling the license ought to be examined.

Apart from that, it has been submitted that once an order has been passed by the licensing authority against which there is a provision for appeal in the Control Order of 2016, there is no reason why the request of the petitioners to interfere with such order be accepted and the petitioners be not asked to avail of their appellate remedy, which is as efficacious.

In response to the aforesaid argument of the State, Mr. Singh, learned senior advocate for the some of the petitioners, has submitted that all the above contentions of the State are not worth accepting. He has submitted that if the notice itself is faulty, it matters not whether it has been responded to. If the contents of the notice does not reflect the proposed action against a noticee, no effective reply could be given with respect to such proposed action and any reply which has been furnished would only be seen in the context of allegation which has been leveled against such noticee.

Assuming but no admitting that the charges have been responded to but, for all practical purposes, the core issue namely the response of the noticees to the proposed action would not have been answered.



With respect to the availability of the alternative remedy, it has been urged on behalf of the petitioners that in *Whirlpool Corporation Vs. Registrar of Trade Marks, Mumbai and others, (1998) 8 SCC 1*, an exception has been carved out in the event of availability of alternative remedy that if any action is in violation of statutory provisions, the party is not necessarily required to be relegated to the appellate or revisional authority as may be available under the Act in question.

It has further been contended that in *M/s Oryx Fisheries Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Union of India & Ors., 2010 (13) SCC 427*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has specifically stated that at the stage of show-cause notice, the person concerned/noticee ought to be told the charges against him so that he can take his defence and prove his innocence.

Any defect in the notice strikes at the root of the matter and the proceedings cannot be salvaged on any count whatsoever.

It may however be noted that if the notice would have only stated that if there is no explanation worthy of acceptance, further action as contemplated under the Control Order, 2016 will be taken, that would also have sufficed as the only further action contemplated under the Control Order of 2016 is cancellation of license. But, in the present set of notice, action proposed is under



the National Food Security Act, 2013. This definitely leaves the notices without any idea about the proposed action.

After being heard the learned counsel for the parties, we are of the considered opinion that the notice does not contain the proposed cause of action under which Act and therefore it is no notice in the eyes of law. That the petitioners have responded to such notice on which a decision of cancellation of license has been taken but, such decision cannot be sustained merely on the ground that the notice has been answered.

Solely on the aforesaid ground namely the notice not disclosing the cause of action and under which Act, we set aside the order of cancellation of license of the petitioners in all these writ petitions and relegate all these cases to the licensing authority for him to issue a fresh notice to the petitioners within a period of 30 days of the receipt of a copy of this judgment.

The petitioners shall be afforded ample opportunity to represent their cause and, in case, they demand any report on the basis of which the action is proposed to be taken, such document also shall be furnished to them.

Only after adverting to their replies and affording them a hearing, a decision shall be taken by the licensing authority within a further period of 60 days.



Needless to state that such order shall be a reasoned one and the copies of such orders would be made available to the petitioners forthwith.

While saying so, we specify that we have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the respective cases.

We further specify that in the interregnum, the license of the petitioners shall not be restored and there shall be no resumption of the supply of food-grains and the beneficiaries shall be tagged with other licensees of the area.

With the aforementioned observations and directions, all these writ applications are allowed and disposed of.

**(Ashutosh Kumar, J)**

**( Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)**

rishi/-

AFR/NAFR	AFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24.05.2022
Transmission Date	

