



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
WPC No. 1124 of 2026
PRABHA BHURE versus STATE OF C.G.

Order Sheet

20/03/2026	Mr. T. K. Jha, Counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Sabyasachi Choubey, GA for respondent No.1/State. Mr. N. Naha Roy, Counsel for respondents No.2 & 3. Since respondents have already represented, notice against them is dispensed with. Heard on Application for grant of interim relief (IA No.1/2026). Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 is suffering from 80% locomotive disability. She was allotted Shop No. 11 under the disability category quota by the erstwhile Nagar Palika Nigam, Bhilai. Petitioner No.2 is the servant/helping hand of Petitioner No. 1, and they sell chicken to customers in the said shop. However, on 16.02.2026, Respondent No. 3 served a notice (Annexure-P/5) to Petitioner No. 2 (servant of Petitioner No. 1) to close the shop and also to petitioner No.1. He further submits that the Respondent Authority should allot a place to the petitioner to run her shop, but no such place has been allotted by the Municipal Corporation Risali for running a

meat shop. Hence, the notice issued by the respondent is completely unsustainable and interim protection may be granted to the petitioners.

In reply, counsel for Respondents No. 2 and 3 submits that the Gumasta License (Annexure-P/4) was issued in favour of Petitioner No. 2 and not in favour of Petitioner No. 1, who alleges to be the owner of the shop. Further, based on objections raised by local trade associations (Vyapari Sangh), the impugned notice was issued as the sale of meat in the said area is creating a nuisance to the general public. Hence, interim protection should not be granted.

This Court, on the earlier date of hearing (18.03.2026), directed Respondents No. 2 & 3 to apprise the Court as to which place has been allotted to the petitioners for running meat shops in the area of Municipal Corporation, Risali. However, today, counsel submits that no such area has been allotted so far.

Having considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, purely as an interim measure, it is directed that the effect and operation of the impugned notices dated 16.02.2026 (Annexure-P/5 & P/6) issued to the petitioners shall remain stayed until the next date of hearing.

Learned counsel for the respondents prays for and is granted 4 weeks time to file reply.

Sd/-

(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Judge