



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1788 of 2026

RAJEEV VERMA *versus* STATE OF CHHATTISGARH

Order Sheet

22/04/2026	Mr. Shakti Raj Sinha, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. S.S. Baghel, G.A. for the State/respondents No. 1 to 3. Issue notice to the respondents. Learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3/State. Therefore, issuance of notice to him is dispensed with. Issue notice to respondents No. 4 & 5 on payment of process fee through ordinary as well as speed post. PF and copies within seven days. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

the Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Society, Ambikapur, vide order dated 13.01.2023, had categorically held that no irregularity or liability was found against the petitioner and, accordingly, directed that the matter be closed and no recovery be effected; however, it is contended that subsequently, fresh proceedings were initiated by the same authority, and in the meantime, the Presiding Officer had changed, pursuant to which a contrary order came to be passed fastening liability upon the petitioner for recovery of a sum of Rs. 23,61,794/-. It is thus submitted that the two orders passed by the same authority are mutually contradictory and unsustainable in law, and therefore, the petitioner has approached this Hon'ble Court by way of the present petition challenging the subsequent order in light of the earlier order dated 13.01.2023.

On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State submits that the earlier order dated 13.01.2023 was passed on the basis of a closure report submitted by the police authorities; however, it is

contended that, thereafter, a detailed inquiry was conducted by the competent authority, and pursuant to such inquiry, a fresh order dated 27.11.2025 has been passed in accordance with law. It is further submitted that the petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy available under the relevant statutory provisions, and therefore, the present petition is not maintainable at this stage.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that two conflicting orders have been passed by the same Authorities in respect of the petitioner's case, thereby giving rise to serious inconsistency and legal infirmity; it is therefore contended that, in view of such contradictory findings by the same authority, the petitioner has been constrained to approach this Hon'ble Court directly by way of the present petition, seeking appropriate relief against the impugned action.

In the event that any recovery proceedings are initiated against the petitioner, it shall be open for the petitioner to approach this Hon'ble Court, and upon

such approach, the interim application filed by the petitioner shall be duly considered in accordance with law. Further, in case any coercive action is taken against the petitioner, the petitioner shall be at liberty to mention the matter before this Court for urgent listing, and at that stage, appropriate consideration shall be given to the grievance of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 1 to 3 are directed to file their reply.

Name of Mr. Anand Shukla, Advocate has wrongly been mentioned in the cause title and as such the Registry is directed not to publish the name of Mr. Anand Shukla, Advocate.

List this case after service of notice.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge