



CGHC010122902025

2026:CGHC:44702

NAFR

Digitally
signed by
PRIYANKA
VERMA
Date:
2026.10.16
18:18:36
+0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1801 of 2025

1 - Satish Dani S/o Late Beniram Dani Aged About 62 Years R/o C-13,
Sector-2, Avanti Vihar, Raipur, Tehsil And District Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Urban
Administration, Mahanadi Bhavan, Capitol Complex, Naya Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Collector, Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Sub-Divisional Officer, Raipur (C.G.)

4 - The Tehsildar, Raipur (C.G.)

5 - Raipur Development Authority, Through Its Chief Executive Officer, Raipur
(C.G.)

6 - Chief Executive Engineer, Raipur Development Authority, Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Ankur Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondents No.5 & 6	:	Mr. Pankaj Agrawal, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Anmol Sharma, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order on Board

15/10/2026

1. The petitioner, in this Writ Petition, has prayed for the following reliefs:-

*“A. A writ and/or an order in the nature of writ of
appropriate nature do issue commanding and*

directing the respondents to produce before this Hon'ble Court all the relevant records pertaining to the case of the petitioners for its kind perusal.

B. A writ and/or an order in the nature of writ of appropriate nature do issue to provide compensation to the petitioner for their acquired land or deliver the vacant possession of acquired land.

C. A writ and/or an order in the nature of writ of appropriate nature do issue to decide the representation of the petitioner and in violation of principles of natural justice and the respondent authorities be directed to provide the compensation to the petitioners in respect of the land.

D. Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts & circumstances of case.

E. Cost of the petition may also be awarded.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be permitted to file an appropriate application before the concerned authorities, i.e., the RDA, respondents No. 5 and 6.
3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents No. 5 and 6/RDA has no objection if such a limited direction is issued.
4. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court is of the view that the ends of justice would be served if the petitioner is permitted to file an appropriate application before the concerned authorities. Accordingly, the petitioner is at liberty to file such an application before the concerned authorities (respondents No. 5 and 6), who shall consider the same and pass an appropriate order in

accordance with law, after giving due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within 60 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.
6. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Priyanka