

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 1860 of 2020**

1. Sharif Khan S/o Basarat Khan Aged About 40 Years Incharge- Samiti Prabandhak, Reg. No. 1424, Block Kashdol, Tehsil Kashdol, District Baloda Bazar Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
2. Suryakant Patel S/o Tilakram Patel, Aged About 29 Years Incharge- Fad, Paddy Procurement Center, Sub Center- Khaira, Thargaon And Reg.No. 1424, Block Kashdol, Tehsil Kashdol, District Baloda Bazar Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Food, Civil Supplies And Consumer Protection Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh Rajya Sahkari Vipran Sangh, Through Managing Director, 6th Floor, Tower C, Commercial Complex, C B D, Sector-21, Block C, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. District Mark- Fed Officer, Chhattisgarh Rajya Sahkari Vipran Sangh, District Baloda Bazar Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
4. Collector, District Baloda-Bazar Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
5. Deputy Registrar, Co-Operative Societies, District Baloda-Bazar Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Soumitra Kesharwani, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Anand Verma, Dy. GA
For Res No.2, 3 & 5	:	Mr. Ashish Surana, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy
Order on Board

03/09/2020

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging the inaction and arbitrariness on the part of the respondents, on one hand, in not collecting paddy within the stipulated period and at the same time, in holding the petitioner responsible for the damage and the shortage caused to the paddy collected.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that once when there is a specific agreement entered into between the petitioner and the respondents, it is expected that the respondents would have first adhered to the conditions stipulated in the agreement and only thereafter the respondents would have initiated appropriate action against the petitioner, if required.
3. According to the petitioner, as per the agreement, it was the duty of the respondents for taking steps in lifting paddy which has not been honoured by the respondents. The further contention of the petitioner is that he has been repeatedly approaching the respondents for early lifting of paddy taking into consideration the frequent change of climate on account of which the paddy so collected by the petitioner was getting damaged or destroyed. According to the petitioner, as per the agreement, the respondents were also supposed to get the paddy properly insured in the event of any damage that occurs, which again, whether the respondents have discharged their liability in this regard or not is not known to the petitioner.

4. The grievance, according to the petitioner, now is that on the one hand, the respondents did not timely lift the paddy because of which it was exposed to extremely weather condition resulting in damage to the paddy. The further contention of the petitioner is that for that damage to the paddy or the shortage of paddy, if any, because of climatic reasons or any other natural reasons, the petitioner cannot be saddled with the liability of damage of the same nor can the petitioner be held responsible for any criminal offence by registering of an FIR etc. According to the petitioner, he apprehending coercive measures to be taken up by the respondents as has been done against the officer bearers of other similarly placed society. Counsel for the petitioner referring to two orders passed by this Court in WPC 1417/20 & WPC 1448/20 submits that the present writ petition also be disposed of in similar terms. He further requests that let the respondents first conduct an investigation or a preliminary inquiry in respect of the alleged shortage of paddy or damage to the paddy and thereafter reach to a conclusion as to who is actually responsible for the damage or shortage so caused and only then the authority should go in for registering of an FIR, if required.
5. Counsel appearing for the respondents submit that it is only the petitioners' apprehension that an FIR would be registered without any investigation or inquiry. It is the contention of the counsel for the respondents that due care shall be taken by the respondents firstly in determining as to who is actually responsible for the damage or shortage of paddy and only thereafter an FIR would be registered, if required.
6. Given the submissions by the counsel for the respondents and the apprehension that has been made by the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the present writ petitions also can be disposed of in similar terms.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of directing the respondents first to undertake preliminary inquiry/investigation in respect of any alleged shortage of paddy or loss caused to the respondents in the process of purchase of paddy. That in the course of inquiry, it should be found out as to whether there has been a shortage of paddy or not, there has been any damage or loss caused to the respondents or not and whether the said shortage or damage was in fact caused because of a deliberate and willful act on the part of the petitioner or any office bearers of the petitioner and only thereafter the respondents would take appropriate steps in terms of the agreement / contract entered into between the parties.
8. In the event, if there is any further dispute regarding the quantity or quality of the paddy etc., all those issues would be resolved in terms of the agreement entered into between the parties and the standards and specifications provided for the same in the agreement.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Rohit