

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 1330 of 2019**

Anil Kumar Pandey S/o Late Bhagwat Prasad Pandey, Aged About 72 Years
R/o Station Ward Bhatapara, Tehsil And Police Station Bhatapara, District
Balodabazar - Bhatapara Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, South Eastern Central Railway, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Divisional Commercial Manager, South Eastern Central Railway, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Divisional Railway Manager, South Eastern Central Railway, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
4. Chief Commercial Inspector, South Eastern Central Railway, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Prakash Kumar Mishra, Advocate

For Respondents : Shri Abhishek Sinha, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****09/04/2019**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the sister of petitioner was running a tea stall at Bhatapara railway station and after her death the petitioner was allowed to continue to run the same. It is contended that without any authority the said process

is being discontinued and even if any tender was made the petitioner was not informed. Therefore, the petitioner may be allowed to run the tea stall at Platform No. 1 & 2 at Bhatapara railway station further he may be allowed to take part in the tender proceedings.

3. Learned counsel for respondents referred to Annexure P4 which is an order dated 24/08/2015 and would submit in the earlier round of litigation the petitioner was given the breather to continue the tea stall till the new tender process was completed. It is stated that the tender process has now been completed and it has been allotted to someone else, and before allotment publication of tender in the newspaper was also made, but petitioner had not participated in it.
4. Perused the order dated 24/08/2015. Perusal of the order passed in WPC No. 1352 of 2015 would show that as purely temporary measure the petitioner was allowed to run the tea stall till the fresh tender in respect of allotment of tea stall was finalized. The order further purports that it was an interim arrangement to run the tea stall and specifically it has been observed that it would not confer any right on the petitioner to claim for license and the outcome would depend on the tender proceedings. Since the statement has been made at the bar on instructions that the tender process has now been completed nothing remains to be adjudicated in this case and the right has already been

adjudicated in the earlier round of litigation. If the petitioner has not participated in the tender he has to search answer from himself.

5. The petition being devoid of merits is dismissed.

Sd/-
Goutam Bhaduri
Judge