

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

REVP No. 29 of 2019

- Santoshi Mahila Swa Sahayata Samuh Village Rudha, Post Pakin, Block Saraipali, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh, Through Its President Saroj Patel W/o Khirod Patel, Aged About 42 years, R/o Village Rudha, Post Pakin, Block Saraipali, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh Village Chattigirola, Tashsil And Police Station Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh, Through Its Secretary Smt. Rajni. Gandha Choudhary W/o Shri Radheshya Choudhary, aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Chattigirola, Tahsil and Police Station Saraipali, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, Department Of Women And Child Welfare, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Director, Directorate Of Women And Child Welfare, Indrawati Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Collector, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

5. District Programme Officer, Women And Child Welfare,
District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

6. Project Officer, Integrated Child Development Programme,
Women And Child Welfare, Block Saraipali, District
Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Raghavendra Pradhan, Adv.
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri Kishore Narayan, Adv.
For Respondent-State	:	Shri Avinash Singh, PL

Order On Board By

Hon'ble Justice Shri Prashant Kumar Mishra

13/02/2019

1. This Review Petition has been preferred for review of the order dated 12.12.2018 passed in WPC No.2278/2018, by which this Court has set aside the order passed against the writ petitioner/present respondent No.1 Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh terminating the agreement in its favour to supply ready to eat food material. The review petition has been preferred on the ground that after the adverse order against the respondent No.1, the present petitioner was allotted the work, therefore, the order could not have been passed by the Writ Court without giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner or without canceling the order of

allotment in its favour.

2. The argument appears to be misconceived. Admittedly the present petitioner was nowhere in the picture on the date when the adverse order was passed against Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh neither the present petitioner was a complainant against Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh. That being the matter, there was no occasion to afford opportunity of hearing to the petitioner while hearing the writ petition.
3. Petitioner has come in the picture only when fresh arrangement was made entitling it to supply ready to eat food material, but since after the quashment of the order against Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh, the allotment in favour of present petitioner is subsumed and cannot be given effect to, as this Court has already found that the adverse action against Jai Ambe Swa Sahayata Samuh was not in accordance with law.
4. There is no substance in this review petition. It fails and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
Prashant Kumar Mishra
Judge

Ankit