



2026:CGHC:15292-DB



2026:CGHC:15292-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPCR No. 170 of 2026

Manish Koomar S/o Sri Bhim Munda Aged About 44 Years R/o Opposite Nath Hospital, Kadru, P.O. Doranda, P.S. - Argora, District Ranchi, Jharkhand
... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Anti-Corruption Bureau/ E O W, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh

2 - Chhattisgarh State Marketing Corporation Limited Through The Excise Commissioner Having Its Office At Fourth Floor Abkari Bhawan, Near Chokranala, Labhandi Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Chhattisgarh State Beverages Corporation Limited Through Its Manager Having Office At Behind Essar Petrol Pump Near C S E B Bill Collection Office Siltara Raipur Chhattisgarh
...**Respondent(s)**

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner : Ms Gayatri Chouhan, Advocate
For Respondent/State : Shri Vivek Sharma, AG
For Respondent-2 : Shri Malay Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal
Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice
02.04.2026

1. Petitioner has filed the present petition for the following reliefs:

- i. direct the Respondents to carry out the investigation in a fair and transparent manner, which



though is not reflected in the actions of the State Respondent.

ii. direct the Respondents to show cause, as to how the petitioner has been labelled as “shell company”, in the counter affidavit filed before this Hon’ble Court, without even initiating any enquiry or investigation against the existence of the petitioner and the nature of business carried out by the petitioner.

iii. direct the Respondent No.2 & 3 to show cause whether the firm of the petitioner has supplied Indian-made foreign liquor or not, in terms of letter dated 13.02.2024 issued by the Respondent No.3 and if any payment separately has been made to the petitioner.

iv. hold and declare that the Investigating Agency cannot get prejudiced by the alleged offences and the past business relations of the petitioner’s firm with the accused.

v. Pass any other order the Hon’ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice.



2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the present petition.
3. Learned State counsel has no objection.
4. Accordingly, the writ petition stands **dismissed as withdrawn** without any further liberty.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice