

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1106 of 2015**

- Jagriti Mahila Swa-sahayata Samuh, Bandha, through the Secretary, Smt. Chandrawati Masih, W/o G.A. Masih, aged about 75 years, R/o Bandha, Takhatpur, Civil & Revenue District Bilaspur (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through : Secretary, Women and Child Development Department, Mahanadi Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur (CG)
2. District Project Officer, Women and Child Development Department, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG)
3. Child Development Project Officer, Integrated Child Development Project, Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (CG)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner : Shri HB Agrawal, Sr. Advocate with Shri KS Pawar, Adv.
For Respondent/State : Shri Shashank Thakur, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****27/10/2015**

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the advertisement issued by the Project Officer, Women and Child Development, Takhatpur inviting applications from eligible persons for supply of ready to eat food material for the sector Vijaypur.
2. The writ petition was preferred on the ground that the petitioner is still

supplying ready to eat food material, therefore, Vijaypur sector is not available for advertisement.

3. It is the stand of the State Government that agreement executed with the petitioner for supply of ready to eat food material was valid and operative only till 31.3.2010, therefore, after expiry of the said period, the petitioner has no right or entitlement to continue to supply ready to eat food material. It is also stated by the State Counsel that even if supply was obtained from the petitioner for some period after the said date, that would not amount to automatic or implied extension of contract.
4. In the absence of any written contract on and after 31.3.2010, it cannot be said that the petitioner is legally entitled to supply ready to eat food material for the sector Vijaypur. Therefore, issuance of advertisement is neither illegal nor arbitrary.
5. It is stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has also applied pursuant to the advertisement. Needless to say that the petitioner's application shall be considered by the respondents in accordance with law.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed with afore-stated observations.

Sd/-
Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)