

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1621 of 2020**

BSP Karmchari Upbhokta Bhandar (ID 431004101) Sector-2, Ward No. 49, Bhilai, District Durg Chhattisgarh, Through Its President Manoj Sao S/o Shri Katiman Sao, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Q.No. A-1, Street-6, Sector-2, Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Food, Civil Supplies And Consumer Protection, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar Nawa Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. The Director, Directorate Of Food, Civil Supplies And Consumer Protection, Block No. 2, 3rd Floor Indrawati Bhavan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. The Collector (Food), Collectorate Office, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh
4. The Controller (Food), Behind Collectorate Office, Durg, District Durg Chhattisgarh
5. Durga Mahila Swa Sahayata Samooh (ID 431004103) Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vipin Tiwari, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Sudeep Verma, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****24.08.2020**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 06.03.2017 passed by the respondent no.4 allotting ration card holders

of the petitioner Society who were running the fair price shop at one point of time to another Society. The number of ration card holders of the petitioner's society went below 500 and therefore, the ration card holders of the petitioner's society were allotted to a different society.

2. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that the petition suffers from delay laches inasmuch as the order impugned is one which was passed in March, 2017 and the present writ petition has been filed now in August, 2020 i.e. after more than 3 ½ year. In addition to the delay laches, another reason why this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition is that the petitioner themselves admit that at the time of passing of the impugned order Annexure P-1, the number of ration card holders with the petitioner's society was much less than 500 which in other words means the action on the part of the respondents in merging the ration card holders of the petitioner's society with another Society was justified.
3. Under the circumstances, this Court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner for interference with the impugned order at this stage. Accordingly, the writ petition stands rejected.
4. However, the rejection of the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner from approaching the authorities under the respondents for ventilating its grievance.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**