



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

104+237

**LPA-2073-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 13.01.2026**

Food Corporation of India and others

....Appellants

Versus

M/s Hira Foods and others

....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate
for the appellants.

Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Sachin Kamboj, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Sandeep Chhabra, Additional Advocate General, Haryana.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the impugned order dated 24.06.2025 passed in CWP-17517-2025 by the learned Single Judge.
2. A bare perusal of the impugned order dated 24.06.2025 would show that the respondent decided to accept the category of rice which meets the quality standard in accordance with the agreed term, which is clear from paragraph 3 of the order and keeping in view the said agreement, conditions were imposed in paragraph 4 for the supply of the said custom milled rice.
3. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that certain facts



-: 2 :-

could not be brought to the notice of the learned Single Judge with regard to conduct of the respondent-miller, and hence the present appeal.

4. On being asked whether or not they want to go back to the learned Single Judge for filing a review on those certain facts which were not brought to the notice of the learned Single Judge, the learned counsel for the appellants submits that the validity of the order dated 24.06.2025 is to be ascertained on the basis of the same argument, which is now being raised before this Court in the present appeal.

5. Any argument which has not been raised before the learned Single Judge, cannot be made a ground to challenge the validity of such order. Though liberty was given to the learned counsel for the appellants to file a review, but he submits that he does not have the instructions to withdraw the present appeal in order to file a review for the same.

6. Keeping in view the fact that it is conceded before that the arguments which are now being raised to assail the order of the learned Single Judge were not pressed before the learned Single Judge, hence, the same argument cannot be considered to adjudicate the validity of the order in question.

7. Further, *prima facie*, the fact, that the order dated 24.06.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge was a conceded order, is clear from the recording of the facts mentioned in paragraph 3 of the said impugned order. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.



-: 3 :-

- 8. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.
- 9. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

January 13, 2026
Varinder

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No