

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WP (S) No.760 of 2017**

Bhupendra Das Sonwani, S/o Shri Budharu, aged about 40 years, R/o Village Sinoha, Post Office Nevra, P.S. Tilda, District Raipur (CG).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation Through Its President, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Secretary, Food Supplies And Consumer Protection, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents**AND****WP (S) No. 764 of 2017**

Tulsi Ram Kaushik, S/o late Shri Arjun Prasad Kaushik, aged about 48 years, R/o Lingiyadih, Rajkishore Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (CG).

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation Through Its President, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

4. The Secretary, Food Supplies And Consumer Protection, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

AND

WP (S) No. 767 of 2017

Suresh Kumar Kashyap, S/o Shri Sunder Lal Kashyap, aged about 41 years, R/o Village Limhi, P.O. Vijaypur, Via-Kargi Road, P.S. Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (CG).

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation Through Its President, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, General Administration Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Secretary, Food Supplies And Consumer Protection, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

AND

WP (S) No. 769 of 2017

Tirath Ram Yadav, S/o Shri Bulkhu Ram Yadav, aged about 43 years, R/o village Parsada, Post Kodiya, District Durg (CG).

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation Through Its President, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Ware Housing Corporation, 22, Anand Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, General Administration

Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

4. The Secretary, Food Supplies And Consumer Protection, State Of Chhattisgarh, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Distt. Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners :Ms. Pritha Ghoshal, Advocate
 For Respondents/State :Ms. Astha Shukla, Panel Lawyer and Mr. B.D. Guru, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

14/02/2017

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners' cases are not being considered by respondent authorities for regularization whereas, they are working with the Corporation for more than 10 years and are entitled for regularization and, therefore, they may be permitted to make representation before the competent authority and the same may be directed to be decided within the specific time frame.
2. Be that as it may, if the petitioners file representation before the competent authority for redressal of their grievances, it is expected from the authority concerned to decide the same in the light of judgment of Supreme Court in the case of *Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others Vs. Umadevi and Others*¹ and in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of representation of the petitioners.
3. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case and the concerned authority would be at liberty to

¹ (2006) 4 SCC 1

decide the same in accordance with law.

4. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petitions stand finally disposed of. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal
Judge

L