

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 118 of 2021

- Chhattisgarh Sahkari Samiti Karmchari Sangh Raipur Registration No. 6685, Through Its State President Ishwari Sahu Aged About 48 Years, S/o Shri L.R., Sahu R/o Ward No. 1, Ramnagar, Kawardha, Police Station And Tahsil- Kawardha, District Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh -Mo. 9329671445 **---- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Food, Civil Supplies And Consumer Protection, Mahanadi Bhawan New Mantralaya Raipur, Police Station Rakhi, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Registrar, Co- Operative Societies Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Managing Director Chhattisgarh State Marketing Federation Maryadit, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Tahsil And District Raipur, Chhattisgarh,

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Ratnesh Kumar Agrawal, Advocate

For Respondent/ State : Mr. Amrito Das, Addl. A.G.

For Respondent No. 3 : Mr. Prafull N. Bharat & Mr. Akash Pandey, Advocates

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

29.01.2021

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's society- Union is a representative of the employees of various co-operative societies which are engaged in purchase of the paddy, therefore while making a policy of the State, the petitioner's society should have a say

in making such policy matters. Therefore, the opportunity of hearing while making of policy should be given to the petitioner.

2. Learned State counsel opposes the argument made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner cannot have any say about the making of the policy. The State, according to the existing circumstances, from time to time can amend and revive different policies.
3. After going through the pleading, this Court is unable to understand that what is the locus of the petitioner since the petitioner is the representative of the employees of the various co-operative societies which involves in purchase of the paddy, therefore how far their interest is involved is not clear before this Court. Even otherwise in making a particular policy about the paddy procurement herein, the Court will not sit as a supervisory authority to interfere in the policy matter. It is for the Government to decide and to lay down the different policies according to the circumstances, which they feel proper and best to the interest of the citizens. The interference of this Court cannot be warranted unless the citizens come up and demonstrate that the policy which has been framed shocks the conscience. No factual grounds have been made out before this Court to show that how the policy is to be interfered, therefore the petition being devoid of merits, is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

(Goutam Bhaduri)

JUDGE

