



2026:CGHC:13222



2026:CGHC:13222

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPC No. 1205 of 2026**

Unnayak Seva Samiti Through Its President, Sidhanta Shankar Mohanty, S/o Late Sarat Chandra Mohanty, Aged About 52 Years, 960/22, Kelo Vihar Colony, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Women And Child Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur , District Raipur(Cg)

2 - Director Directorate Of Women And Child Development District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Collector District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

4 - District Programme Officer Of Women And Child Development Department, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh

5 - The Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Women And Child Development, A Wing, Room No. 310 Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For Respondents 1 to 4/State	:	Dr. Arham Siddiqui, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.5		Mr. Ramakant Mishra, DSGI and Mr. Rishabh Dev Singh, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)**Order on Board****19.03.2026**

1. The petitioner has preferred this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking following relief(s):-



10.1 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash and set-aside the impugned communication/order dated 29/12/2025 issued by the Director, Directorate of Women and Child Development to Collector/Secretary, District Child Development and Protection Committee, of all district. [ANNEXURE P/1].

10.2 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondents to allow the petitioner's society to run concerned centre without any hindrances and also allow to continue the previous fundings given to the petitioner's society.

10.3 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other writ/ writs, order/ orders, relief/ reliefs in favour of the petitioners, which the Hon'ble Court deemed fit & just in the facts and circumstances of the case, including awarding of the costs to the petitioner.

2. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission of the Court to withdraw this petition with liberty to file fresh petition, if occasion arises.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents have no objection if the prayer of the petitioner is allowed.
4. On due consideration, prayer is allowed and the petitioner is permitted to withdraw this petition with liberty as prayed for.
5. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn.
6. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Judge