CGHC010136782026 2026:CGHC:46528

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1838 of 2026

1 - Savitri Sahu Wife Of Late Pitambar Sahu Aged About 64 Years Resident Of Village Jognipali, Saraipali, District- Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Food And Civil Supplies Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District- Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - Collector Cum Food Officer, Food Branch Mahasamund District- Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

3 - Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Saraipali, District Mahasamund,chhattisgarh

4 - Tahsildar, Saraipali, District Mahasamund,chhattisgarh

5 - Krishi Upaj Mandi Samiti Saraipali, Through Secretary Saraipali, District- Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

6 - Chhattisgarh State Coperative Marketing Federation Limited, Through Secretary, 6th Floor, Tower-C, CBD Sector 21, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

7 - District Marketing Officer/ Nodal Officer, Chhattisgarh State Co-Operative Marketing Federation Limited, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

8 - Society Manager/president Krishak Seva Sahakari Samiti Maryadit, Joganipali District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Yogesh Kumar Chandra, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Priyank Rathi, GA

For Respondents No.6 & 7	:	Ms. Shristi Attal, Advocate
For Respondent No.8	:	Mr. Siddharth Pandey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

03/11/2026

1. This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, challenging the action of the respondents in refusing to procure 115.20 quintals of paddy offered by the petitioner for sale during the Kharif year 2025-26 despite issuance of a valid token, hence, the petitioner prays for the following reliefs:

> *"10.1 That this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent to permit the petitioner to sale his remaining paddy of 115.20 quintals in the kharif year 2025-26 and direct to accept the paddy.*
>
> *10.2 That this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authority to accept the paddy i.e. 115.20 quintal as per the Token No. TK58012601252600806 which was granted to the petitioner on 08.01.2026.*
>
> *10.3 That this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to take decision over the representations of the petitioner (Annexure P-5).*
>
> *10.4 Any other relief, which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper, may also be passed in favour of the petitioner."*

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though Token No. TK58012601252600806 was issued to the petitioner for sale of 115.20 quintals of paddy, the same was not procured by the Paddy Procurement

Centre without assigning any reason and the petitioner's token was cancelled, thereby depriving her of the opportunity to sell her paddy. Subsequently, the State Government issued an order dated 03.02.2026 extending the paddy procurement dates for 05.02.2026 and 06.02.2026. Despite the extension, petitioner could not avail the procurement benefits, as the process involves token generation, scheduling, verification and delivery, which cannot practically be completed within two days. Therefore, petitioner prays for a direction issued to the respondent authorities to issue procurement tokens to her and purchase her paddy.

3. Learned counsel for the State and other respondents submits that State Government has extended the dates, i.e., 05.02.2026 & 06.02.2026 subject to the condition of the physical verification of the paddy of the farmers. However, petitioner herself was negligent in not following the procedure, consequently, she could not deposit her paddy and it could not be purchased by the respondent authorities. Now after expiry of the last date, fixed for purchase of the paddy, no order can be passed for purchase of the same. Hence, the instant writ petition is not maintainable.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that the date for procurement of paddy was extended up to 05.02.2026 and 06.02.2026, under certain condition, however, the petitioner could not deposit the paddy, as such no further extension can be granted nor any order can be passed under the writ petition 226 under the jurisdiction of the Constitution.

5. Accordingly, the instant writ petition being devoid of merits, the same is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Priyanka