

**In The Court of Commissioner, Saran Division, Chapra**

**Supply Revision No. 231/2011**

**Shivjee Sah  
Vrs.**

**The State of Bihar**

**ORDER**

23-02-2016- The instant revision application is directed against the impugned order passed by D.M. Gopalganj in Misc. (Supply) Appeal case No. 28/2009 on 24.10.2011.

The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner Shivjee Sah S/o Late Laxmi Sah, R/o Vill-Neruai, Panchayat-Ekdanga. Block-Hathua, Dist-Gopalganj was a PDS licensee. Further case is that the petitioner's PDS shop was inspected by BSO, Hathua and on finding the following irregularities during inspection like the dealer was absent without any prior information, non displaying of price cum stock list, allegation of charging excess price for k.oil than the prescribed price and non production of various register even on demand which led to sending of report to the SDO Hathua by BSO, Hathua vide letter No. 76 dt.14.05.2007. Thereafter, the SDO issued a show cause notice to the concerned dealer and the show cause reply submitted upon which the opinion of BSO, Hathua was sought for. Thereafter on finding that the show cause reply submitted by the petitioner to be unsatisfactory, the said license was placed under suspension and second show cause notice was issued. Then the second show cause reply alongwith the various documents submitted by the petitioner was sent to the District Level Selection Committee for consideration of the case of the petitioner. However, the DLSC in its meeting dated. 04.02.2008 rejecting the recommendation sent by SDO Hathua, resolved otherwise to cancel the petitioner's license and accordingly the said license was cancelled by the SDO on 20.02.2008. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a Supply Revision No. 86/2008 before this Court and this Court after hearing the case was pleased to remand the case back to the Court of D.M. Gopalganj vide order dt. 19.05.2009 with a direction to pass a reasoned order after hearing all the concerned parties. Thereafter a case vide Misc (Supply) Appeal case No. 28/2009 was initiated in the Court of D.M. Gopalganj and after hearing the parties, the said case was dismissed vide order dt. 24.10.2011 on the ground that the petitioner had failed to disprove the alleged charges of irregularities through any concrete evidence. This led to filing of the present revision case before this Court.

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner at the very outset of his argument submitted in details about the whole sequence of events leading to coming up of this case before this Court for the second time. He further submitted that the learned D.M. without considering the direction contained in the remand order of this Court dismissed the appeal which is illegal and arbitrary. He further argued that although the petitioner had filed sufficient documentary evidence to contradict the

b

alleged charges, but the same were not appreciated and the impugned order was passed which is against the relevant provision of the PDS (control) order. He lastly submitted that the impugned order is fit to be set aside.

The learned Spl. P.P. appearing on behalf of the D.M. Gopalpanj on the other hand argued that the impugned order is cogent, reasoned and proper having no infirmity as such the same be upheld.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, material available on records, pleadings advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, it is seen that the learned D.M. has passed a detailed and reasoned order after touching on every aspects of the case and after hearing the parties. It is also obvious that the learned D.M. has held that the earlier decision of the DLSC was taken after careful consideration and accordingly the appeal was not fit to be allowed for the reason that the petitioner has failed to contradict the alleged irregularities reported against him. Certainly, the said findings of D.M. Gopalpanj can not be termed arbitrary or illegal rather the same appears to be proper and valid. In fact, the petitioner has failed to set forth any good ground for the interference in the said findings of D.M.

Thus, for the aforesaid reasons, I am constrained to uphold the impugned order and hence the same is upheld accordingly.

In the result this revision application is dismissed.

Dictated and Corrected by me.

*b*  
*23.2.16*  
Commissioner,  
Saran Division, Chapra

*b*  
*23.2.16*  
Commissioner,  
Saran Division, Chapra