

**THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT  
BILASPUR**

**W.P. (C) NO. 1503 /2011**

**PETITIONER**


:- Shyam Lal Dhanker, aged about 56 years, S/o Shri Dhirpal Dhankar R/o Village Rajoli, Tahsil Gunderdehi, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

**VERSUS**

**RESPONDENTS**

- 1:- State of Chhattisgarh through the Secretary, Forest Department, D.K.S.Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Additional Collector, Durg (C.G.)
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Patan, Distt. Durg (C.G.)
4. Divisional Forest Officer, Durg (C.G.)
5. The Tahsildar, Gunderdehi, Distt. Durg (C.G.)

P.R. No. 1599/2011  
Presented by M. T. Haidar  
dated 26/3/2011



**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**



16

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR**

**WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 1503 OF 2011**

**PETITIONER**

**Shyam Lal Dhanker**

**Versus**

**RESPONDENTS**

**State of Chhattisgarh & Others**

**(Writ Petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India)**

**Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

**Present :- Shri D.N.Prajapati, Advocate for the petitioner.**

**Shri V.V.S.Moorthy, Dy. Advocate General for the State.**

**ORDER (ORAL)**

**(Passed on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2011)**

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks a direction to the respondent No.4 to take immediate action regarding restart of Saw Mill as per direction given by the respondent No.3 vide order dated 22.03.2010.
2. At the very outset, learned counsel appearing for the State respondents submits that this petition has become infructuous in view of the order dated 07.07.2011 (Annexure R-1) passed by the Divisional Forest Officer, Durg, wherein, it has been observed that since the Revenue department has no objection and the permission to run the Saw Mill has been granted on a condition that if the decision of the Revenue Court comes against the petitioner, then the licence to run the Saw Mill shall automatically stand suspended. Meaning thereby, that there is no objection by the respondent authorities in running of the Saw Mill by the petitioner.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner does not controvert the above submission.
4. In view of the foregoing, the writ petition is dismissed, as having become infructuous.

**Sd/-**

**Satish K. Agnihotri  
Judge**