

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WP (C) No. 2138 of 2017**

Gayatri Mahila Swa-Sahayata Samuh, Sakrapali (M), Through Its President Smt. Gwalin Bai Wife Bhujbal Yadav, Mahila Swa Sahayata Samuh, Sakrapali (M), Village Mohtara (N), Block- Bilaigarh, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh

---- **Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Women And Child Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Director, Women and Child Development Department Indravati Bhawan, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Commissioner Raipur Division, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Collector District- Balodabazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
5. The District Programme Officer, Women And Child Development Department, District Balodabazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
6. The Project Officer, Integrated Child Development Project, Bhatgaon, District Balodabazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
7. Mahalaxmi Mahila Swa-Sahayata Samuh, Village Mohtara, Block Bilaigarh, District Balodabazar- Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr.C.R.Sahu, Advocate
For State	:	Mr.Shashank Thakur, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

03/08/2017

1. The petitioner seeks to challenge the order of the Collector as well as the State Government. The petitioner group was granted contract to supply ready to eat food and by order dated 15.9.2016 it has been set aside by this Court and matter was remanded back to the District Level Committee. The District Level Committee after hearing

the petitioner group found that the order is in accordance with law and granted right to respondent No.7, against which, the petitioner group preferred an appeal before the State Government, which has been dismissed as not maintainable. Now the petitioner has filed the instant writ petition challenging the order of the Collector.

2. The Collector has clearly recorded a finding that the petitioner's ready to eat food was found sub-standard and also recorded a finding that the petitioner group has rightly been removed from the work.
3. Sufficient opportunity was given to the petitioner and after hearing the petitioner group the impugned order has been passed and respondent No.7 has only been granted the right to supply ready to eat food for temporarily. No interference is warranted.
4. Since the petitioner group has not been debarred from further participating a fresh, if fresh tender will be invited, the petitioner group is free to make his candidature which will be considered by the respondents in accordance with law.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition finally stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K.Agrawal)
Judge

B/-