

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WA No. 455 of 2019***{Arising out of order dated 24.07.2019 passed by the learned Single Judge in
Writ Petition (C) No. 1674 of 2016}*

- Devnath Singh Rajput S/o Late Shri Kapil Dev Aged About 49 Years Kalindi Kunj, Near Kabir Chowk Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Co - Operative Society Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Chhattisgarh Co-Operative Marketing Federation Through The Managing Director, Civil Lines, Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The District Marketing Officer Chhattisgarh State Co-Operative Marketing Federation, Raigarh, Tahsil And District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Appellant	:	Shri Abhishek Chandravanshi, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri Sudeep Verma, Deputy Government Advocate.
For Respondent No.2&3	:	Shri R.S. Baghel, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

Judgment on Board**P. R. Ramachandra Menon, Chief Justice****20.11.2019**

1. Challenge is against the interference declined by the learned Single Judge, whereby the Appellant/Writ Petitioner has been relegated to move for the redressal of his grievance by other appropriate means/alternate remedy.
2. During the course of submissions, it is brought to the notice of this Court by the learned counsel for the Appellant as well as the learned Standing counsel appearing for the Respondents/Marketing Federation that though the Appellant

has been awarded the contract in respect of transportation under different notifications, the present issue is with regard to a contract which came to an end on 31.01.2014. With regard to the disputed payment with reference to relevant clauses, if there is any grievance, it was quite open for the party concerned to have moved the Arbitrator by invoking the Arbitration Clauses, in accordance with law.

3. The learned counsel for the Appellant seeks for permission to withdraw the appeal without prejudice to the rights and liberties in this regard.
4. Permission is granted. The writ appeal dismissed as withdrawn.
5. It is made clear that we are not mentioning anything with regard to the merit involved in this appeal.

Sd/-

(P. R. Ramachandra Menon)
Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)
Judge