

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BANGLADESH  
HIGH COURT DIVISION  
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

**WRIT PETITION NO. 650 of 2015**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

An Application under Article 102 of the Constitution of the  
People's Republic of Bangladesh

-AND-

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

M/S Sadia Enterprise

....Petitioner

-Versus-

The Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Bangladesh Secretariat,  
Ramna, Dhaka and others

....Respondents

No one appears.

....For the petitioner

Mr. Md. Anichur Rahman Khan, D.A.G with

Mr. Sultan Mahmood Banna, A.A.G with

Mr. Mir Moniruzzaman, A.A.G

....For the Respondents

Heard on 04.09.2025

**Judgment delivered on 04.09.2025**

**Present:**

Mr. Justice Md. Shohrowardi

And

Mr. Justice Dihider Masum Kabir

**Md. Shohrowardi, J.**

On an application filed under article 102 of the Constitution of the People's  
Republic of Bangladesh, Rule was issued in the following terms:-

“Let a Rule Nisi be issued calling upon the respondents to show  
cause as to why the decision taken by the respondents through the  
District Seed and Fertilizer Monitoring Committee, Bagerhat  
taken in its meeting dated 18.11.2013 (Annexure-E) so far as it  
relates to abrupt suspension of the allotment of the fertilizer to the  
petitioner in violation of the Certificate for Dealer of Fertilizer  
(Control) Order, 1999 and “সার ডিলার নিয়োগ ও সার বিতরণ সংক্রান্ত সমন্বিত  
নীতিমালা-২০০৯”, the same being without jurisdiction and without any  
lawful authority and hence, is of no legal effect and or such other  
or further order or orders passed as to this court may seem fit and  
proper.”

It appears that at the time of issuance of the Rule on 17.02.2015 operation of the resolution dated 18.11.2013 was stayed upto 02.03.2015. Subsequently, the High Court Division passed an order on 07.09.2016 which is quoted below;

“Let a fresh order of stay be granted up to 02.03.2017, if by that time the Rule is not heard and/or disposed of, the instant Rule shall stand discharged and the order of stay shall stand recalled and vacated.”

In view of the above order, the Rule is discharged.

However, there will be no order as to costs.

Dihider Masum Kabir, J.

I agree.