

103

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 13260 of 2020  
Date of Decision: 01.09.2020

Shree Ganesh Rice Mill

-Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

-Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Ajay Kalra, Advocate, for  
Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)**

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

Petitioner seeks issuance of necessary directions to the respondents to ensure strict compliance and implementation of “*Policy and Guidelines for Paddy Procurement and its milling for Kharif Marketing Season (KMS)*”.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is a registered partnership firm and is involved in the business of custom milling since 2000.

Petitioner has been categorized as Category 'A' Rice Mill as per policy of the previous year i.e. 2018-19.

Guidelines have been formulated by the Department of Food and Civil Supply and Consumer Affair, State of Haryana. As per practice, such policy and guidelines have been issued for each Kharif Marketing Season for the purposes of allocation and allotment of paddy for custom milling to the prospective rice mills. Petitioner was allotted 3006 MT of paddy in the Kharif Marketing Season i.e. 2019-20. Petitioner has delivered the entire bulk even before the target date i.e. 31.03.2020, though subsequently it was extended upto 31.08.2020. The other rice mills have not delivered the required stuff even upto the extended date.

Grievance of the petitioner is that despite the petitioner being Category 'A' Rice Mill, proper allocation has not been made despite its capacity upto 6000 MT. On the other hand, the Department has allocated 5336 MT to one Krishna Rice Mill which is category 'C' rice mill.

Owing to the aforesaid anomalous situation and inappropriate distribution of paddy for custom milling, petitioner filed a detailed representation-cum-legal notice to the respondents on 12.08.2020.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Deipa Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

In view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of serving other respondents at this stage, as no order prejudicial to the interest of any party is being passed.

This writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to appear before respondent No.2 within two weeks and press for deciding his representation-cum-legal notice dated 12.08.2020. In the event of doing so, respondent No.2 shall decide the representation on merits by way of passing a speaking order. If the claim of the petitioner is found to be worth acceptance, then the needful be done for further transaction(s). If the claim of the petitioner is liable to be rejected, then a speaking order be passed and be communicated to the petitioner.

September 01, 2020

Jyoti Sharma

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No