



CGHC010258842026



2026:CGHC:28389

Digitally signed
by RAVVA
UTTEJ KUMAR
RAJU

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 3561 of 2026

Lokchand Rahangdale S/o Shri Janaklal Rahangdale Aged About 54 Years
Present Incharge/ Manager Of Seva Sahkari Samiti Maryadit Rengakharkala
Paddy Procurement Center Rengakhar Jangal R.N. No. 2031 Add- Village
Rengakharkala Post Rengakharkala Tehsil Rengakharkala Dist- Kabirdham
(C.G.)

... Petitioner

Versus

- 1** - State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Co- Oprative Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Atal Nagar, Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.).
- 2** - The Secretary Department of Food And Civil Supplies Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Atal Nagar, Raipur District - Raipur (C.G.).
- 3** - The Managing Director Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited Office At 6th Floor Tower- C Commercial Complex C B D Sector 21 Atal Nagar District- Raipur (C.G.).
- 4** - The Collector Dist- Kabirdham (C.G.).
- 5** - The District Marketing Officer Kabirdham Dist- Kabirdham (C.G.).
- 6** - The Chief Executive Officer District Cooperative Central Bank Maryadit Rajnandgaon District Rajnandgaon (C.G.).

7 - The Deputy Registrar Cooperative Society Dist- Kabirdham (C.G.).

8 - The District Food Officer Dist Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from CIS Periphery.)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Nitesh Sahu, Advocate.
For State	: Mr. Anway Tiwari, P.L.
For MARKFED/Respondent Nos. 3 & 5.	: Mr. Animesh Tiwari, Advocate.
For Respondent No. 6	: Mr. Khyoti Adil, Advocate on behalf of Shashank Thakur, Advocate.

SB: Hon’ble Mr. Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

09/07/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved by the action of respondent authorities as they are directing the petitioner society that the shortage of 586.03 quintal quantity be promptly delivered.
2. It has been specifically mentioned that under the paddy procurement policy pertaining to the year 2025-26, no dry quantity/dryage in respect of paddy center would be allowed and as such, the petitioner was directed to give the quantity of paddy which has not been supplied.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that he has already replied to the notice issued to them. However, the dispute has not been decided by the authorities concerned till date, and as such, the authorities may be directed to consider the said replies of the petitioner and to pass an appropriate order on merits of the case and till then, the said authority may be directed not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner society.

4. On the other hand, learned Advocate appearing for the respective respondents oppose the submissions made by learned advocate for the petitioner.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record with utmost circumspection.
6. Considering the limited prayer made in this petition by the petitioner's society and further considering the fact that the replies have already been filed by the petitioner against the notice issued to him, this Court is of the opinion that the respondent authorities are under an obligation to decide the dispute strictly in accordance with law. However, till the decision of the said dispute, the respondent authorities are directed to not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner.
7. The authorities concerned would be at liberty to pass an appropriate orders on the merits of the case after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The authorities concerned are directed to decide the said dispute within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
8. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation on the merits of the case.
9. With the aforesaid observation/direction, the petition stands **disposed of.**

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge