

(5) (1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.No. 2100/2002

Hoo

PETITIONERS

1. Sunil Gupta aged 32 years S/o OP Gupta resident of 74/15 Nehrunagar East Bhilai- Durg (C.G.)
2. Dr. RB Gupta aged 57 years S/o Late Shri Balkrishan Gupta, 125, Sadar Bazar Ferozpur Cantt(Punjab).
3. Dr(Mrs.) Kanchan Bala Gupta aged 52 years W/o Dr.RB Gupta, resident of 125, Sadar Bazar, Firozpur Cantt(Punjab).
4. Pushpa Rani, aged 46 years W/o Bhagwan Das, 755, Padmanabhpur, Durg(CG).
5. Mr. Kumkum Gupta, aged 48 years W/o MK Gupta resident of Hotel Deluxe, Rourekela(Orissa).
6. Mrs. Anita Gupta aged 42 years W/o Rajindra Gupta, resident of 038, Vasudha Appartments, Sector-9, Rohini, Delhi.
7. Prem Nath, aged 45 years S/o Gorakh ram resident of C/o Jai Bajrang Home Appliances, Station Road, Durg(CG)
8. MS Radhakrishnan aged 62 years S/o Dr. Syama Rao, resident of 56/57 2nd Cross, 22nd Main Raghvendra Layout, Padmanabhnagar, Bangalore.
9. Ku. D.Vimla aged 42 years D/o Shri DV Subhha Rao, resident of qr.no.226 Indian Oil Nagar, IP Road, Andheri West Mumbai.
10. Mrs. D. Lalita aged 62 years W/o DV Subba Rao resident of qr.no.226 Indian Oil Nagar, IP Road, Andheri West Mumbai.

Vs

RESPONDANT

1. Nagar Palika Parishad, Bhilai- Charoda
Through the Chief Municipal Officer, Bhilai-3 Distt-Durg.
2. State of Chhattisgarh.
Through the Principal Secretary, Nagriya Prashashan,
Govt of Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.)

Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner named above most humbly submit as under –

1. PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER –
Particulars of the petitioners are as given in the cause title.

2090/12

P. R. No.
Presented by Shri. R. M. - 80/8/12
dated 30.9.12

R. M. - 80/8/12
A. M.

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक

WP No. 2/00/02

सन् 200

विरुद्ध

| आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित | आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><u>17/12/2002</u></p> <p>Shri R.M. Solapurkar, counsel for the petitioners.</p> <p>Shri Sanjay K. Agarwal, Dy. Advocate General for the State.</p> <p>Heard.</p> <p>This writ petition is directed against the notice dated 15/6/2001 issued by respondent No.1 - Chief Municipal Officer, Bhilai-3, Distt. Durg, whereby an amount has been levied on the petitioner for not starting construction work as per the agreement. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the notice is bad.</p> <p>Having heard learned counsel, the Court is not inclined to entertain this writ petition/ at this stage. If a notice has been served which according to the petitioner is not in accordance with law then nothing prevents them from filing appropriate objections before the appropriate authority raising specific grounds on which the validity of the notice is assailed. Accordingly, if so advised, the petitioners may file their objections and in case that is done, in all fairness the Authority shall look into the matter and pass appropriate orders thereon.</p> <p>With the above observations and directions, this writ petition is disposed of.</p> | <p>Sd/- P.C NAIK Judge</p> |