

cf 500-1.

①

9

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH


AT BILASPUR

W.P.(C) NO. 1492 /2013 Single Bench

PETITIONERS

1. Roshan Lal Gawri, son of Manohar Lal, aged about 52 years, resident of Ruprela Gali, Phaphadih, Raipur, (C.G.) P. S. Ganj Thana, Civil and Revenue District-Raipur.(C.G)
2. Rajesh Kumar Rakhyani, son of Dayal Das, aged about 46 years, resident of Panchsheel Nagar, Raipur, Chhattisgarh .P. S. Civil Lines, Civil and Revenue District-Raipur.(C.G)
3. Murlidhar, S/o Bhagwan Das Laheja, aged about 73 years, resident of A-403, Sai Parisar, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh. P. S. Tarbahar, Civil and Revenue District-Raipur.(C.G)
4. Kamal Laheja, son of Lakshman Das, aged about 51 years, resident of Kaheja Sadan, Opp.

W.P.C. 1492/13
Presented by Shri. S. S. Sahu
dated 25.9.13



Sanjay Kumar

2

10


Raj Bhawan, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh. P. S. Civil
Lines, Civil and Revenue
District-Raipur.(C.G)

5. Anil Nachrani, son of
Mohan Lal, aged about
47 years, resident of
Panchshil Nagar, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh. P. S. Civil
Lines, Civil and Revenue
District-Raipur.(C.G)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through, the Secretary,
Department of Revenue,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Mant-
ralaya, Naya Raipur,
Chhattisgarh
2. Collector, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Nazul Officer, Raipur,
Chhattisgarh



**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

1. PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER (S)

As detailed above in the cause title.

2. PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENT (S)

As detailed above in the cause title.

Sanjay Kumar



129

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SB : HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRITINKER DIWAKER

W.P.(C) NO. 1492 of 2013

PETITIONERS

Roshan Lal Gawri & Others

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of CG and Others

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

Shri Sunil Otwani, counsel for the petitioners.
Shri Sumesh Bajaj, G.A for the State/respondents.

**ORDER
(30.09.2013)**

Grievance of the petitioners in the present petition is that though their land has been utilized by the State government by further alienating it to some lease holders but till date neither the petitioners have been given any benefit nor have been granted any alternative cite.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that purpose of filing this petition would be served if direction is issued to respondent No.2-Collector for deciding the pending representation (Annexure P-18).

State counsel submits that let the petitioners make a fresh representation detailing their claim to respondent No.2 and in turn the same may be decided by the Collector.

The present petition is disposed of permitting the petitioners to file fresh representation before respondent No.2 and in the eventuality of making any such representation by the petitioners the same would be decided by the authority concerned in accordance with law preferably within a period of five months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.



130

It is made clear that this court has not observed anything on merits and it is for the respondent No.2 to decide the same in accordance with law.

Sd/-
Pritinker Diwaker
Judge