



Smale Herri

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR WP (C) NO \78 | /2013

PETITIONER

 Shri Rananjay Singh S/o Shri Ram naresh Singh Caste - Rajput, Age about 47 years R/o Nehru nagar, Bhilai, Tehsil & Dist. Durg (C.G.)Through the Power of attorney Holder Satyendra singh S/o Shri Ram naresh Singh Caste - Rajput, Age about 54 years R/o Nehru nagar, Bhilai, Tehsil & Dist. Durg (C.G.)

Nikita Singh D/o S. Singh, Age 24 years,
 Caste Rajput R/o Nehru nagar, Bhilai,
 Tehsil & Dist. Durg (C.G.)

<u>VERSUS</u>

 The State of Chhattisgarh – Through Seceretary, Revenue Department Raipur (C.G.)

Tehsildar,
 Tehsil-Khairagarh,
 District-Rajnandgaon(C.G.)

<u>RESPONDENTS</u>



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

- PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER
 As per cause title
- PARTICULARS OF THE RESPONDENTS
 As per cause title





HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SB: HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRITINKER DIWAKER

W.P.(C) NO. 1781 of 2013

PETITIONERS

Shri Rananjay Singh & Another

Versus

RESPONDENTS

State of CG and Others

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Shri Vikram Singh, counsel for the petitioners. Shri N.Naha Roy, PL for the State.

<u>ORDER</u> (29.11.2013)

Grievance of the petitioners are that they have filed application for mutation before respondent No.2 -Tahsildar, Khairagarh on 29.06.2012 but the said application has not been decided for the best reasons known to the authorities.

Counsel for the petitioners submit that purpose of filing this petition would be served if direction is issued to respondent No. 2 for deciding the pending case of the petitioners.

State counsel has no objection to the above proposition of the counsel for the petitioners.

Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of directing the Tahsildar to decide the mutation application either way as expeditiously as possible preferably within two months from the next date of hearing if there is no other legal impediment.

It is made clear that this court has not observed anything on merits of the case and the respondent No.2 would be at liberty to decide the case in accordance with law.

Sd/-Pritinker Diwaker Judge