

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 170 of 2011

- M/s A. Ahmadji Bhai, a partnership firm duly registered under the relevant provisions of the Indian Partnership Act, 1932 acting in the premises through its partner Shri Mustansir Ali, Son of Shri Hatim, aged about 41 years, resident of Ahmed Ji Bhai Colony, Raipur (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India, through the Secretary, Ministry of Railways, New Delhi.
2. South East Central Railways, through its General Manager, South East Center Railways, Raipur
3. Senior Divisional Finance Manager South East Center Railways, Raipur,

---- Respondents

And

WPT No. 2324 Of 2011

- M/s Badrinarayan Nandlal, a partnership firm, through its Partner Sri Radha Kishan Bagadiya, S/o. Late Nandlal Bagadiya, aged about 66 years, resident of Subhas Road, Ganjpara, Raipur, inter alia, carrying on business at Subhash Road, Ganjpara Raipur, 492009, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Vs

1. Union Of India, Through : The General Manager, South East Central Railway, Bilaspur (C.G.)
2. The Divisional Railway Manager Raipur, South East Central Railway, DRM Complex, Raipur, (C.G.)
3. The Senior Divisional Commercial Manage Manager, Raipur, South East Central Railway, Drm Complex, Raipur, (C.G.)
4. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd Through The Manager (Retail Sales), Raipur Divisional Office, Indian Oil Bhawan, Rajiv Gandhi Marg, Vip Road, Po Ravigram, Telibandha, Raipur, (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	: Shri B.P. Sharma, Advocate.
For Respondents	: Shri H.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate & Ms. Harshita, Advocate on behalf of the Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board By

08/11/2017

(1) Since common question of law and fact is involved in both the writ petitions, they are being disposed of by this common order.

(2) Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that pursuant to the receipt of bills from the Railway Authorities, the petitioners have made application requesting to reconsider the assessment made and revise the calculation chart so that payment can be made, but the said objection dated 27.03.2010 has not been considered and decided till date and, therefore, railway authorities be directed to decide the said objection dated 27.03.2010 within the stipulated period.

(3) Counsel for the respondents would submit that petitioners' representation/objection /discrepancies will be considered expeditiously.

(4) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.

(5) Be that as it may, respondent No. 3- Senior Divisional Finance Manager is directed to consider and decide the petitioners' objection/representation raising discrepancies dated 27.03.2010 expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(6) Since the interim order is operating since 27.04.2011, that will remain operative till decision is taken by the respondents authorities i.e. within three months from today.

(7) With the aforesaid observations, the writ petitions stand finally disposed of.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-