



2026:CGHC:23962-DB

Digitally signed
by SAGRIKA
AGRAWAL
Date:
2026.06.17
10:24:09
+0530

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPC No. 2259 of 2022**

Hemesh Gandhi S/o Late T.C. Gandhi, Aged About 43 Years R/o Vikas Nagar,
Kondagaon, Block Kondagaon, District : Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, School Education Department,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District : Raipur,
Chhattisgarh

2 - Director, Directorate, Public Instructions, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar,
Nava Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Collector, Kondagaon, District : Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

4 - Sub Divisional Officer, Kondagaon, District : Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

5 - Tahsildar, Tahsil Kondagaon, District : Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

6 - Superintending Engineer, Public Health And Engineering Department,
Kondagaon, District : Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh

7 - The District Education Officer, Kondagaon, District Kondagaon (C.G.) (As
Per Honble Court Order Dated 27-03-2025)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. S. S. Baghel, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

16/06/2026

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking the following reliefs:-

“10.1 That, Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to set aside the order dated 26.11.2021 (Annexure P/1), memo dated 02.12.2021 (Annexure P/2) and the RRC proceedings initiated by the Tahsildar Kondagaon (Annexure P/3).

10.2 That, Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to settle the dispute under clause 28 of the agreement before the Commissioner, Bastar Division.

10.3 Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper may also be passed in favour of the petitioner together with cost of the petition”

2. Learned State counsel has pointed out that subsequent to the filing of the present writ petition, the petitioner preferred two other writ petitions before this Court, namely WPC No. 2484 of 2024 and WPC No. 4344 of 2024, arising out of the same contractual dispute and substantially involving the same cause of action. It is submitted that WPC No. 2484 of 2024 was disposed of by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 09.05.2024, whereby respondent No.7 was directed to consider and decide the dispute raised by the petitioner under Clause 28 of the

agreement dated 25.04.2022, preferably within a period of 90 days. Thereafter, the petitioner again approached this Court by filing WPC No. 4344 of 2024, which was disposed of on 30.08.2024 granting liberty to the petitioner to avail the further remedy available under Clause 28 of the tender document before the competent authority, namely the Chief Engineer. Thus, the grievance sought to be raised in the present petition has already been considered and appropriate directions have been issued by the learned Single Judge in the aforesaid proceedings.

3. In view of the aforesaid facts, it is apparent that the issues involved in the present writ petition are substantially covered by the orders passed in WPC No. 2484 of 2024 and WPC No. 4344 of 2024. Since the petitioner has already availed remedies before this Court in respect of the same cause of action and appropriate directions have been issued therein, no further adjudication is required in the present petition.
4. It was further observed that the petitioner had instituted multiple writ petitions arising out of the same cause of action. Therefore, this Court was initially inclined to impose costs upon the petitioner. However, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the relief sought in the present petition, particularly paragraph 10.2 thereof, is substantially for referring and resolving the dispute under Clause 28 of the agreement, which is in consonance with the directions already issued by the learned Single Judge in the aforesaid writ petitions. Learned counsel for the petitioner has tendered his apology for the filing of the subsequent petitions and has assured the Court that appropriate remedies in accordance with Clause 28 of the tender

document shall be pursued. Considering the said submission and apology, this Court refrains from imposing any costs upon the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, the present writ petition deserves to be and is hereby dismissed on this ground alone.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice