



# <u>IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR [C.G.]</u> <u>Writ Petition No. 26.7.6.../04</u>

#### PETITIONER

Smt. Devki Devi W/o Katti Mistry Caste-Carpenter (Badae), Aged- About 67 Years, R/o-Village-Banki Mogra, Tahsil Katghora, District-Korba [C.G.].

#### **VERSUS**

#### RESPONDENTS

- State Of Chhattisgarh
   Through- Secretary
   Revenue department
   DKS Bhawan, Raipur(C.G.)
- 2. Board of Revenue of Chhattisgarh
  Through- Chairman,
  Bilaspur (C.G.) .
- 3. Collector, Distt.- Korba (C.G.)
- 4.Sub Divisional Officer, (Revenue)
  Katghora

Distt.- Korba (C.G.)

- Chandan Singh S/o late Godari Singh caste- Gond, R/o- Village - Sutarra, Tahsil- Katghora, Distt.- Korba [C.G.]
- 6. Smt. Kaushilya Bai W/o Late Jay Lal Caste- Kanwar, R/o-Village- Mohan pur, Tahsil-Katghora, Distt.- Korba [C.G.].
- 7.Santogh Jaiswal S/o Pusau Ram, Aged- 40 Years, caste- Kalar,
- 8.Ram Pratap Jaiswal S/o- Pusau Ram, Aged-35 years, Caste- Kalar,
- 9.Santlal Jayswal S/o Pusau Ram, Aged-30 Years, Caste- Kalar, (From 7 to 9 are the R/o Village-Sutarra, Tahsil- Katghora, Distt.- Korba [C.G.].



25-8-01

# 5420 fay

# WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

The above named petitioner most humbly and respectfully begs to submit as under:

## उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर



## **आदेश पत्रक** ω ρνο 28 76 οΥ ममला क्रमांक सन् 200

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	30.9.2004
	Shri Sanjay Patel, counsel for the petitioner.
	Shri Sumesh Bajaj, Deputy Government Advocate for the Stat
	respondents No.1 to 4.
	The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 22
	227 of the Constitution of India questioning the legality, propriety of
	correctness of order dated 5.8.2004 passed by the Board of Reven
	Chhattisgarh, in Revision Case No.70/A-23/2003-04, affirming order dat
	1.12.2002 passed by the Collector in Appeal Revenue Case No.8/A-23/200
	2001, affirming the order dated 26.3.2001 passed by the Sub Divisio
	Officer, Katghora, in Revenue Case No.83/A-23/1999-2000, whereby t
	S.D.O. directed the reversion of land in favour of respondent No.5 who
	the son of Late Godri Singh from whom the petitioner purchased the la
Sec. 1	bearing Khasra No.9/3 area 0.10 acre of Village: Sutarra, Patwari Ha
	No.15, Tehsil: Katghora, District: Korba.
	Relevant facts for the disposal of this writ petition are that Lo
	Godri Singh, who was admittedly a tribe, sold his above agricultural land
	the petitioner in the year 1975. Thereafter, in the year 1980, vide Madh
	Pradesh Land Revenue Code (Amenament) Act, 1980 (for short 'the Ac
	provisions of Section 170-B of the M.P. Land Revenue Code, 1959 (for she
	'the Code'), were inserted. Sub-section (1) of Section 170-B of the Co

envisages that if any person who on the date of commencement of the

above Section is in possession of agricultural land which belonged to a

आदेश का

दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित

## उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर



कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार \

के अन्तिम आदेश

### आदेश पत्रक

A Service of Services	14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					لحالم المرافقيون	
	मामला व्र	<b>न्माक</b>		, · · · ·	सन्	200	
					+ 7		1
***********	***********		<b>ंविरुद्ध</b> ःः			******	

आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित

member of a tribe which has been declared to be an aboriginal tribe under sub-section (6) of Section 165 shall, within two years of such commencement, notify to the Sub Divisional Officer in such form and in such manner as may be prescribed, all the information as to how he has come in possession of such land. Admittedly, the petitioner herein had not given such information after commencement of the Act and insertion of the provisions of Section 170-B of the Code to the concerned S.D.O. However, respondent No.5, who is the son of Late Godri Singh, made a complaint to the S.D.O. about the transfer of land, on that complaint proceedings were initiated and vide order dated 26.3.2001 the S.D.O. passed an order for reverting the land to respondent No.5 against which the petitioner preferred a nappeal before the Collector, the same was dismissed against which the petitioner preferred a revision before the Revenue Board and the same was also dismissed. Now, the petitioner has approached this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that in the year 1975, the petitioner constructed a Kachha house on the land and thereafter, in the year 1999 after demolishing the same he constructed a Pakka house, but no benefit has been given to the petitioner herein as provided in clause (b) of sub-section (3) of Section 170-B of the Code.

But, I do not find any substance in the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner for the reason that in the first instance, the

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित

## उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर



## आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक सन् <sup>200</sup>

आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —3 —	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
benefit of clause (b) of sub-section	(3) of Section 170-B of the Code can be
given to the petitioner only when	the information under sub-section (1) of
Section 170-B of the Code was giv	ven by the petitioner; the same was not
done by the petitioner. Proceeding	s were initiated under sub-section (2) of
Section 170-B of the Code on	the application of respondent No.5;
therefore, the above provisions ar	e not attracted. Even otherwise, proviso
to sub-section (3) of Section 170-	B envisages that "where the building or
structure has been erected aft	er the 1st day of January, 1984 the
provisions of clause (b) above sh	all not apply". Admittedly, as per the
argument of the learned counsel fo	r the petitioner, Pakka house in question
was constructed by the petitioner	in the year 1999. Therefore, on this
ground also the petitioner is not e	ntitled for the benefit of clause (b) of
sub-section (3) of Section 170-B of	the Code.
For the aforesaid reasons	I do not find any substance in this
petition. Further, I do not find ar	y illegality, infirmity or incorrectness in
the impugned orders. Ultimately, t	here is no force in this petition hence, it
is dismissed.	
Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.25	36/2004 and I.A.No.6230/2004 stand
disposed of.	
	Sd/-
	L.C. Bhadoo
	Judge

Soma/Padma

Will book

[पीछे देखिये