
(1992) 08 NCDRC CK 0021

In the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission

C. NUKLAMMA

APPELLANT

Vs

DISTRICT CIVIL SUPPLIES OFFICER

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-08-1992

Acts Referred:

Citation : 1992 3 CPJ 190

Hon'ble Judges : S.C.Mohapatra , R.N.Panigrahi , J.Patnaik J.

Advocate : N.K.Nanda

Judgement

1. A letter addressed to the President of the State Commission purported to have been sent by the wives of C. Samudra and CI. Kondeya of Rausapatna, Cuttack, was received by the President of the Commission copy of which was also forwarded to Collector, Civil Supplies Officer, Sub Collector, Minister, Food and Civil Supplies, local M.L. A. who is also a minister and two control dealers notice price was sent to the Collector and the Civil Supplies Officer. They have not stated their case in spite of valid service of notices.

2. CASE has been stated by the Civil Supplies Officer that complainants were getting their supplies regularly firstly from the retailer A.H. Khan and later from Md. Erphan. At that time they were staying in house of I. Sengupta in Holding No. 262. When the house owner stated on 2.9.91 that complainants' husbands were not staying in that house and prayed for cancellation of their Ration Card, enquiry was made by Marketing Inspector who found the report to be correct On that basis instruction was issued not to release commodities on basis of such cards. It has been stated that in case card holders satisfy that they are staying in any other holding within Cuttack Municipality the matter would be enquired into and on truth of the version ration cards will be transferred to the new Holding and Ward. Since the Minister, Food and Civil Supplies, and the local M.L.A. who is also a Minister have been appraised of the situation, we are not inclined to give our findings on the allegations made at this stage. We, however, call upon the Collector and the Civil Supplies Officer to make personal enquiries and try to assist them since it is stated that they are staying in Ward No. 19 Rahusa Patna.

All Public Officers should keep in mind obser action of a Division Bench of Orissa High Court in the decision reported in ILR 1976 Cut. 862 Ranganath Misra v. State of Orissa and Others. It reads as follows: "The authorities in whom powers have been vested to exercise the control should come forward to ease the situation when there is hardship in the working process".

What has been observed while examining the technical approach of an inspecting authority of a private educational institution is also equally applicable to this case.

With the observation aforesaid, the complaint is disposed of. Complaint disposed of.