

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1205 of 2017**

Santosh Gupta S/o Shri Vishwanath Gupta, Aged About 35 Years
 Assistant Manager/ Paddy Purchasing Incharge, Adim Jati Sewa
 Sahakari Samiti, Mahavir Ganj, District Balrampur, Ramanujganj
 (Chhattisgarh) **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Food And Civil Supplies,
Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur (Chhattisgarh).
2. Collector, (Food Department) District Balrampur- Ramanujganj
(Chhattisgarh).
3. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), Balrampur, District Balrampur-
Ramanujganj, (Chhattisgarh).
4. Naib Tahsildar Ramanujganj, District Balrampur- Ramanujganj
(Chhattisgarh) **---- Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. V.K. Pandey, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. D.R. Minj, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****01/05/2017**

Heard on admission.

1. The petitioner has approached this Court ventilating grievance that quantity of paddy belonging to the petitioner was seized on certain allegations and proceedings have been drawn by the Collector but till date, those proceedings have not been concluded nor any order passed and in the meantime, the petitioner learnt that entire seized quantity of paddy is being put to auction.
2. After going through the contents of the petition and documents annexed herein, I find that show cause notice has been issued to the petitioner only on 12.04.2017 on certain allegations. The matter is still being inquired into. The petitioner has submitted his reply. The operative reason for the petitioner to rush to the Court is because the

seized quantity of paddy is likely to be put to auction.

3. Even if it is put to auction, the respondents are supposed to keep the records/accounts of auction so that if ultimately the proceedings are dropped, the petitioner would be entitled to sale proceeds of the seized quantity of paddy.
4. Nevertheless, the proceedings initiated against the petitioner, need to be decided as early as possible. Considering that the show cause notice was given to the petitioner only on 12.04.2017, I do not consider it expedient to limit the period within which the inquiry should be concluded and order should be passed except an observation that the proceedings should be concluded as early as possible.
5. The petition is accordingly disposed off.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)

J U D G E