

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Contempt Case (C) No. 505 of 2015**

Shri Dauji Chawal Udyog Sirri Kharora through its Proprietor Prahlad Kumar Pandey S/o Late D.R. Pandey aged about 46 years R/o village Sirri Tahsil Kharora Raipur Police Station and Post Raipur Civil and Revenue District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. Ajay Singh Secretary Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection Department Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Capital Complex New Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Thakur Ram Singh Collector Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner : Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri P. Sam Koshy, J.****Order on Board****Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice****18/11/2015**

1. The present application has been filed alleging disobedience of order dated 19.6.2015 in Writ Petition (C) No.1002 of 2015 by which, the rice mill of the Petitioner was directed to be opened and extension of time was granted by four months for deposit of milled rice from the paddy supplied to him.

2. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that despite repeated efforts made by the Petitioner for deposit, coupled with seeking directions as to where the deposits have to be made, there was no response from the Respondents who in this manner have flouted the order of the Court. It was also submitted that the Petitioner was informed that some review applications had been filed and till they were decided the deposits would not be accepted. Strong reliance has been

placed on the representations stated to have been filed by the Petitioner expressing his willingness to deposit rice and seeking directions with regard to the locations for deposit.

3. We have considered the submissions.

4. The rice mill of the Petitioner was opened pursuant to the order dated 19.6.2015 is not in dispute. We have gone through the representation filed by the Petitioner in purported compliance of his obligations under the order dated 19.6.205 offering to deposit the milled rice. Surprisingly, all the representations of the Petitioner are completely silent with regard to the quantity of rice that the Petitioner proposed to deposit. If four months extension was granted, obviously the Petitioner was to deposit the balance rice milled in a staggered form. Furthermore, there is no statement in the representations what was the locations for deposit mentioned in the original agreement and that he had gone to the designated place for deposit of the specified amount of rice but was refused acceptance.

5. In the aforesaid circumstances, we are not satisfied that any case is made out for violation of order dated 19.6.2015.

6. The contempt application is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE