



2026:CGHC:23694



2026:CGHC:23694

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 2567 of 2026

1 - Komal Ram Verma S/o Shri Guhlade Ram Verma Aged About 52 Years Present Samiti Manager Prathmik Krishi Shakh Sahkari Samiti Maryadit Karga R.N. No 1044 And Add- Village Kulhadi Post- Siri Tehsil- Kurud Dist- Dhamtari (C.G.)

... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary Department Of Co-Operative Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Atal Nagar Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Secretary Department Of Food And Civil Suppliers Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya Atal Nagar Raipur District- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Manager Chhattisgarh State Cooperative Marketing Federation Limited Office At 6th Floor Tower -C Commercial Complex C B D Sector 21 Atal Nagar District- Raipur C G 492002.

4 - The Collector Dist- Dhamtari (C.G.)

5 - The District Marketing Officer Dist- Dhamtari (C.G.)

6 - The Chief Executive Officer Cooperative Central Bank Maryadit Dhamtari District - Dhamtari (C.G.)

7 - The Deputy Registrar Cooperative Society Dist- Dhamtari (C.G.)

8 - The District Food Officer Dist- Dhamtari (C.G.)

... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner(s)	:	Shri Shivam Mishra, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Shobhit Mishra, Dy GA.



For Respondent Nos.3 & 5	:	Shri Siddharth Pandey, Advocate.
-----------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad
Order on Board

15/06/2026

1. This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner being aggrieved by the action of respondent authorities as vide letter dated 27.04.2026, they are directing the petitioner society that the shortage of 455 quintal quantity displayed on the paddy procurement portal be promptly delivered.
2. It has been specifically mentioned that under the paddy procurement policy pertaining to the year 2025-26, no dry quantity/dryage in respect of paddy center would be allowed and as such, the petitioner was directed to give the quantity of paddy which has not been supplied.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit he has already replied to the notice issued to them. However, the dispute has not been decided by the authorities concerned till date, and as such, the authorities may be directed to consider the said replies of the petitioner and to pass an appropriate order on merits of the case and till then, the said authority may be directed not to take any coercive steps against the petitioner society.



4. On the other hand, learned advocates appearing for the respective respondents oppose the submissions made by learned advocate for the petitioners.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record with utmost circumspection.
6. Considering the limited prayer made in these petitions by the petitioners society and further considering the fact that the replies have already been filed by the petitioners against the notice issued to them, this Court is of the opinion that the respondent authorities are under an obligation to decide the dispute strictly in accordance with the law. However, till the decision of the said dispute, the respondent authorities are directed not to take any coercive steps against the petitioners.
7. The authorities concerned would be at liberty to pass an appropriate orders on the merits of the case after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The authorities concerned are directed to decide the said dispute within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.
8. It is made clear that this Court has not made any observation on the merits of the case.



2026:CGHC:23694

9. With the aforesaid observation/direction, this petition is disposed
of.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Avinash