

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 2211 of 2021

Ghasi Ram Suryawanshi S/o Shri Dashrath Suryawanshi, Aged About 52 Years R/o. Village Bahtarai (Sakri), District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Co-Operative, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Collector, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
3. Branch Manager, Prathmik Seva Sahkari Samiti, Sakri, Having Its Registration No. 45, Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Lavkush Kumar Sahu, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Amrito Das, Additional A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

12/05/2021

1. The grievance of the petitioner seems to be the non-releasing of the money payable to the petitioner on the selling of the paddy for the paddy procurement season 2013-14.
2. Present is a second round of litigation. Earlier the petitioner had preferred WPC No. 2332/2014 (Shankar Lal Dubey & Ors. v. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.), which was disposed of on 12.01.2015. Vide the said writ petition, the High Court had directed the District Collector, Bilaspur to examine the matter through a senior officer and to take appropriate decision. Subsequently, it appears that the petitioner seems to have moved a fresh application before the Collector and the Collector in turn has vide Annexure P/1 dated 15.03.2021 passed an order directing the respondent No.3-Society to release the payment payable

to the petitioner. However, the order of the Collector does not seem to have been complied with, which has led to the filing of the present writ petition.

3. The petitioner thereafter has moved another application before the District Collector on 13.04.2021, which still seems to be pending consideration before the District Collector. The only grievance of the petitioner is that for quite sometime, the petitioner's genuine claim is unnecessary being delayed for no fault of his.
4. The learned Additional A.G. at this juncture submits that since the respondent No.2 has already passed an order vide Annexure P/1 necessary compliance has to be done at the end of respondent No.3.
5. Given the said submission by the counsel for the parties, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the petition pending, rather ends of justice would meet if the writ petition is disposed of at this juncture directing the respondents No.2 to ensure that the representation Annexure P/4 dated 13.04.2021 made by the petitioner is considered and decided at the earliest ensuring due compliance of the order dated 15.03.2021, passed by the respondent No.2 unless the same is challenged or subsequently superseded by any other order passed by any other higher authorities. Let an appropriate decision be taken by the respondent No.2 within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
VACATION JUDGE