

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 4375 of 2019**

Mahalaxmi Swa-Sahayata Samuh Samuh Durgapur, Through Its Secretary - Smt. Manisha Paikra Aged About 28 Years Wife Of Shri Lakhansai Paikra, Resident Of Village Kanchan Nagar Tahsil Shankargarh, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Women And Child Development Department Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Nawa Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Collector District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh
3. The District Programme Officer Women And Child Development Department District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh
4. Madhu Mahila Svyam Sahayata Samuh Bharatpur, Block Shankargarh, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rahul Mishra, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Ashutosh Mishra, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/12/2019**

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking quashment of the order Annexure P-1 dated 20.11.2019 so far as the allotment made in favour of the respondent No.4 is concerned.
2. At the outset, this court is of the opinion that writ petition would not be maintainable as there is an alternative remedy available to the petitioner in terms of the guidelines framed by the State Government dated 05.06.2017 whereby Clause 8.1 clearly envisages that in the event if any person is aggrieved of any action on the part of the respondents the remedy lies by raising a dispute before the District Collector in the form of

a first appeal and the appeal has to be preferred within a period of 30 days.

3. Given the fact that State Government itself has created a mechanism for settlement of disputes and for redressal of grievance by providing a appellate form to the aggrieved person. The present writ petition at this juncture would not be maintainable.
4. Right of the petitioner stands reserved for approaching the concerned District Collector against the order under challenge in the present writ petition or any other action on the part of the respondents.
5. Needless to mention that petitioner would have the liberty to challenge the said order of the Collector in accordance with law afresh.
6. The writ petition thus stands dismissed as not maintainable with the aforesaid liberty.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Rohit