

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 288 OF 2017

Vijay Advertising and Consultancy, through its Sole Proprietor Vijay Deshmukh, S/o Late Neelkanth Rao Deshmukh, aged 37 years, R/o EWS -67, Nehru Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Public Relation Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. Director, Public Relation, Directorate Public Relation, Chhotapara, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Chhattisgarh Samwad, Associate Institution of Public Relation, Department of Chhattisgarh, through its Chief Executive Officer, Near Public Relation Directorate, Chhotapara, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Director, Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity, Phase-V, Soochna Bhawan, C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi
5. Central Vigilance Commission, Satarkata Bhavan, A-Block, GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Prafull Bharat, Addl. Advocate General.
For Respondent 3	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

Per Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan, C.J.

17/04/2017

1. This Writ Petition is filed in relation to engagement of advertising agency by the Government of Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chhattisgarh Samwad, which is the institution involved in regulating the advertisements, through its learned Counsel, submits that the present advertisement need not be treated as one that would be in relation to the area where the Petitioner has sole rights and that wherever the Petitioner has sole rights it will be at liberty to make independent offers touching over which it, presently, has sole rights. It will also be then open to the Petitioner to request the 3rd Respondent to make, if possible, proportionate modifications in the terms and conditions, including regarding the financial aspects.

3. With this, the ground raised in this Writ Petition against the invitation of competitive offers is repelled and the Writ Petition is ordered directing that if the Writ Petitioner makes a representation in the light of what is stated above, the 3rd Respondent will consider that in accordance with law.

Sd/-
(Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)
Chief Justice

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge