

6 (3)
CF 1002
Single Bench

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH
AT BILASPUR

2281
W.P. (C) No. : /2009

PETITIONER

- : 1). Smt Chandra Narayan Das, aged about 80 years, W/o Late H. Narayan Das, R/o Shop No. 11, Civic Centre, Bhilai - Dist Durg (Chhattisgarh) though her General Power of Attorney holder Shri Hemant Bamwani, aged about 43 years, S/o Late Shri H. Narayan Das, R/o Shop No 11, Civic Centre, Bhilai - Dist Durg (C.G.).

PR. No. 2362/09
Prasanna-3 Harashwardhan
dated 29/4/09

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

- : 1). Steel Authority of India Ltd., Bhilai Steel Plant, registered under Indian Companies Act of Government of India with its Head Quarters at Ispat Bhawan, Lodhi Road, New Delhi, through the Managing Director, Bhilai Steel Plant, (S.A.I.L) Bhilai (C.G.).
- 2). The Chief Town Administrator, Bhilai Steel Plant (S.A.I.L.), Bhilai (C.G.)
- 3). Sunil Kumar Daga, S/o Late Vithaldas Daga, aged about 48 years, R/o Shop No. 12, Civic Centre, Bhilai, (C.G.)

PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226, 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

1) PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER





126

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 2281 OF 2009

Petitioner

Smt. Chandra Narayan Das

Versus

Respondents

Steel Authority of India Ltd. & Others

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226, 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(SB : Hon'ble Mr. Satish K. Agnihotri, J.)

Present :- Shri Harsh Wardhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri B.D. Guru, Advocate for the respondent No.1 & 2.

Shri Shashank Thakur, Advocate for the respondent No.3.

ORDER (ORAL)

(Passed on 31st day of August, 2010)

1. Shri Guru, learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1 & 2 submits that the sole grievance of the petitioner is that his representation/ application dated 14.11.2007 / 16.11.2007 was rejected without stating reasons and application of mind.
2. Shri Guru further submits that the respondent No.1 & 2 may be permitted to reconsider again the representation/application dated 14.11.2007 / 16.11.2007, in accordance with law and pass the detailed reasons after affording an opportunity of hearing to all the concerned parties.
3. Shri Harsh Wardhan, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that since this Court directed *status quo* as obtained on 04.05.2009 in respect of the petition's scheduled land, the same may be maintained till disposal of the application of the petitioner.
4. Shri Guru submits that there is no objection and the *status quo* as directed by this Court on 04.05.2009 would be maintained till the disposal of the application of the petitioner, as aforestated.
5. In view of foregoing, nothing survives for adjudication in the petition. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Satish K. Agnihotri

Judge