

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****WPC No. 2870 of 2017**

M/s Vinay Rice Industries, through its Proprietor, Murlidhar Lalwani, S/o Late Shri Chandiram Lalwani, Aged about 56 years, R/o Shanti Colony Chowk, Shihawa, Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

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

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department of Food & Civil Supplies, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office & Police Station Naya Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, Through The Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector (Food), Dhamtari District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.
4. District Marketing Officer, Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited, Dhamtari District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.
5. State Bank of India, through the Chief Manager, State Bank of India Dhamtari, District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh.

**---- Respondents**


---

|                             |   |                                  |
|-----------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner              | : | Mr. Rajendra Tripathi, Advocate. |
| For Respondents/State       | : | Mr. Aditya Sharma, Panel Lawyer. |
| For Respondents No. 2 to 4: | : | Mr. P. Bharat, Advocate.         |
| For Respondent No. 5        | : | Mr. P.R. Patankar, Advocate.     |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal****Order On Board****31/10/17**

1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that the agreement entered into between the petitioner and respondent No. 2 on 30.11.2016 for the year 2016-17 be extended for execution of custom milling.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner has also preferred a representation before the respondent No. 3-Collector, Dhamtari on 22.08.2017 for extension of the agreement period but that has not been considered and decided till date.
3. Mr. Bharat, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 4 would submit that the agreement was extendable only for the Kharif marketing season 2016-17 and is not extendable beyond that.
4. At this stage, Mr. P.R. Patankar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 5 would submit that the Bank Guarantee and FDR submitted by the petitioner has been encashed and given to the respondent No. 4.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length.
6. Be that as it may, the petitioner is at liberty to make an additional application before the Collector, Dhamtari for redressal of his grievances that will be considered and decided in accordance with law expeditiously.
7. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

**(Sanjay K. Agrawal)**

Judge