

(3)
Chatt

(1)

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH JUDICATURE
AT BILASPUR

W.P.NO. 2456 /2003.

PETITIONER

Satyanarayan Gupta, aged
about 45 years, son of Shri
Sarju Prasad Gupta,
resident of LI.G. 72
Shailendra Nagar, Raipur
(Chhattisgarh).

P. R. No. 2223/03
Presented by Shri U.R. Kallay
dated 04.06.03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. Municipal Corporation
Raipur, a Body Constituted
under the Municipal
Corporation Act, 1956 at
Raipur.
2. State of Chhattisgarh,
through Secretary, Local
Self Government,
Chhattisgarh, Raipur,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur
(Chhattisgarh)

RECEIVED COPY.
47803
CLERK TO A.G. BILASPUR

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN FORM OF MANDAMUS OR
IN ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE FORM THAT MAY BE DEEM
APPROPRIATE UNDER THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE
CASE OR ANY OTHER DIRECTION OR ORDER.

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक

wp 2456/03 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<p>30/08/2003: -</p> <p>Heard Shri S.S. Agrawal counsel for the petitioner and Shri Sanjay Ku. Agrawal, Dy. A.G., for the State/respondent, on advance copy. -</p> <p>The petitioner has preferred this petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India alleging that the petitioner has purchased a plot bearing No.D249 having an area of 1500 square feet situated in Shailendra Nagar, Raipur by a registered sale deed under the scheme of the Raipur Development Authority. The aforesaid plot was originally taken on permanent lease from erstwhile Raipur Development Authority. Respondent No.2 is the successor body of respondent No.1 by which the predecessor in title of the petitioner namely Smt. Leela Bai wife of Kanhailal Awadhiya became the lessee of the said plot and copy of the lease deed is Annexure-P/2. Under the terms of the lease deed Smt. Leela Bai was entitled to transfer the said lease right to any person under Rule 37 of the Madhya Pradesh Nagar Tatha Gram Vivesh Viksit Bhumiyan Grihon Bhawan Tatha Anya Sanrachna Ke Viniyaman Niyam, 1974. The only condition imposed that the predecessor is required to pay 10% premium charge. The petitioner applied to respondent No.1 for changing the name in the record but no reply has been received. The petition also moved an application on 25/01/2001 for transfer of his name. The petitioner has</p>	

[पीछे देखें]

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	<p>come to know that there was a dispute with respect to the land situated in that particular area about which the petitioner was unaware but has come to know that a compromise has been effected with respect to the whole area of which the petitioner is not aware. The respondents are not responding to the representation of the petitioner. Therefore, Therefore, the petitioner has prayed for issuance of a writ of mandamus commanding the respondents to record the name of the petitioner in plot No.D249 and approve the map for construction of the building on it.</p> <p>Having heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a representation raising his all grievances within ten days from today to respondent No.1. On receiving the representation of the petitioner, respondent NO.1 shall consider the same within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the representation and pass an appropriate order and communicate to the petitioner. Respondent No.1 is further directed to take decision on the applications moved by the petitioners earlier in an objective manner and pass appropriate orders on the same.</p> <p>With the above observation, the petition is disposed of.</p>	<p>Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge</p>

Brajesh

Rat
5/9/03