11-11

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR CHHATTISGARH

W.P. No. 79 /2000

(PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION)

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR WRITS IN THE NATURE OF CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION ETC. AND FOR APPROPRIATE FURTHER DIRECTIONS

PETITIONERS :

- Atmaram, age about 48 years, s/o Late-Bhagwani.
- Amarnath, age about 42 years, s/o Narayan.
- 3. Ramnath, age about 62 years, s/o Late-Sukaluram.
- 4. Neharu, age about 36 years, s/o Late Nathuram.
- 5. Smt. Kalyanibai, age about 32 years, Wd/o Late Laxminath.
- 6. Minor Shashikant, age about 9 years,
 D/o Late Laxminath, Through Guardian and
 next friend Smt. Kalyanibai.
- 7. Minor Ku. Indu, age about 7 years, D/o late Laxminath, Through guardian and next friend Smt. Kalyanibai.
- 8. Minor Ku. Khilesh age about 4 years,
 D/o Late Laxminath, Through guardian and
 next friend Smt. Kalyanibai.

All residents of village Lalpur P.o.-Bagbahara, Tahsil and District -Mahasamund.

Versus

RESPONDENTS: 1. The State of Chhattisgarh through Collector Mahasamund.

2 ___

- 2. The Board of Revenue, Gwalior (M.P.) (Presiding Officer Shri K.K.Verma- Member)
- 3. Additional Commissioner, Raipur, Division-Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
- 4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Tahasil and District Mahasamund (Chhattisgarh)
- 5. Naib Tahasildar, Sub Tahasil Bagbahara, Tahasil and District Mahasamund (Chhattisgarh)
- 6. Govind Ram Khanna, age about 70 years,
 S/o Kashiram Khanna, Resident of Village
 Lalpur P.o. Bagbahara, Tahasil and District
 Mahasamund.

DETAILS OF THE PETITION

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, मुक्सप्रदेश, जनलाहर शिक्षा विश्वासी रिक्षा विश्वासी विश्वासी विश्वासी विश्वासी विश्वासी विश्वास

M. P. Land Revenue Code MA 199 other then Service watte State of Phh

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	14.12.2000. Shri P.S.Thakur,	P. R. Ne. Presented by Time
	learned counsel for the	Pothica of a Product & on
	petitioners. Heard on question	the chocks
	of admission. 2. The petitioners	
	are aggrieved by the order passed by the Reven	ue!
	Court directing the mutat	ion
	of the name of respondent no.6 in the revenue recor	
	3. The grievance of the petitioners appears	Fraceeding Substitution
	to be that without issuir	/Aton-apply
	proper notice and without making any enquiry into	for order. Checke
	the transfer deed, the Revenue Courts illegally	and dul
	directed mutation in favour of respondent no.	
	4. From the records,	
	it appears that the land	is to lead the

आदेश पत्रक (पुर्वानुबद्ध)		
आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित कार्यालयीन मा के अ	
	-2-	
	in dispute was purchased by Kashi Ram,	
	father of respondent no.6. The respondent	
	no.6 made an application for mutation of	
	his name and the said application was allowed	
	by the Tehsildar and that order was confirmed	
and the second s	in appeal by the Sub-Divisional Officer, in	
	2nd appeal by the Additional Commissioner	
	and in the revision by the Board of Revenue.	
	From the records, it also appears that the	
	said records have also influenced the Board	
	of Revenue that on an earlier occasion, the	
	dispute had come before the Civil Court and on	
	an investigation into a title of respondent no.6,	
	the Civil Court recorded a finding in his favour.	
	Undisputedly the judgments delivered in the	
	Civil Court Observes and holds that respondent	
	no.6 was the owner of the property and neither	
	there was a fraud nor illegality in the said	
	sale, then it would not, for making any further	
	enquiry. The finding recorded by the Civil Court	
1	was certainly binding upon the Revenue Courts.	
	5. After hearing the learned counsel for the	

petitioners, I am unable to hold that the order passed by the Revenue Court calls for any interference.

4-4/99-20,000 .

Sd/-R.S. Garg Judge