

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

**W.P.(C) No.26948 of 2022
(Through hybrid mode)**

***Krupajala Self Help Group,
Balasore***

.... Petitioner

Mr. S. K. Das, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha and others

.... Opp. Parties

Ms. Suman Pattanayak, AGA
Mr. S. Moharana, Advocate-Caveator

CORAM: JUSTICE ARINDAM SINHA

**ORDER
31.10.2022**

**Order
No.**

01.

1. Mr. Das, learned advocate appears on behalf of petitioner-Self Help Group (SHG). He submits, his client had agreement to supply 'Chhatua'. He refers to the agreement at annexure-3. He submits, by impugned order dated 1st June, 2022, his client has been disallowed to continue further after 31st May, 2022. He submits further, all requisitions made prior thereto were complied with by his client. In the circumstances, impugned order be set aside and quashed.

2. Ms. Pattanayak, learned advocate, Additional Government Advocate appears on behalf of State. Mr. Moharana, learned advocate appears and submits, his client has been awarded the work and as such caveat has been filed. He seeks service of the writ petition.

3. It appears petitioner's agreement commenced on 19th August, 2021 and was to remain in force till 31st March, 2022. By impugned order, the District Welfare Officer has said that there were several irregularities in the working of petitioner. It is not at all serious for rectifying the irregularities. Instead the authorities have been misled. Hence, the contract agreement was rescinded and petitioner disallowed to continue further after 31st May, 2022.

4. As aforesaid, the agreement period expired on 31st March, 2022. It appears, thereafter the authority has refused to enter into fresh contract agreement by disallowing petitioner to continue. Irregularities have been alleged. Petitioner disputes the same.

5. The writ Court cannot go into disputed questions of fact. Furthermore, there is no question of termination of agreement since the agreement period has expired. Petitioner cannot be said to have a vested right regarding obtaining future contract. In the circumstances, petitioner may approach the authorities for reconsideration of their intention to work, if so advised.

6. The writ petition is disposed of as above.

(Arindam Sinha)
Judge

Sks