



CGHC010355592022

2026:CGHC:31074

NAFR

Digitally
signed
by
SUMIT
KUMAR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WP227 No. 675 of 2022

1 - Smt. Aparna Tripathi D/o Shri Ram Milan Mishra, W/o Shri Abhishek Tripathi, Aged About 40 Years R/o B-14, Avinash New County (Incorrectly Referred To As Founty In The Impugned Order), Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh. Additional Address-Aparna Mishra, Principal, Krishna Public School, Sarona, Indraprast Colony, Ring Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Ku. Kandisha Tripathi, D/o Shri Abhishek Tripathi Aged About 5 Years And Smt. Aparna Tripathi, Through Her Natural Guardian Mother, Smt. Aparna Tripathi, D/o Shri Ram Milan Mishra, W/o Shri Abhishek Tripathi, Aged About 40 Years. R/o B-14, Avinash New County (Incorrectly Referred To As Founty In The Impugned Order), Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh. Additional Address-Aparna Mishra, Principal, Krishna Public School, Sarona, Indraprast Colony, Ring Road, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

--- **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - Anand Tripathi S/o Late Shri Poharisharan Tripath, Aged About 66 Years R/o 77/14, Nehru Nagar, East Bhilai, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh

2 - Smt. Snehlata Tripathi, W/o Shri Anand Tripathi, Aged About 64 Years R/o 77/14, Nehru Nagar, East Bhilai, District : Durg, Chhattisgarh

--- **Respondent(s)**

WP227 No. 764 of 2022

Abhishek Tripathi S/o Shri Anand Kumar Tripathi Aged About 40 Years R/o A-203, Amaltash Moulshree Vihar, V.I.P. Road, Police Station Telibandha, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

---**Petitioner(s)**

Versus

Smt. Aparna Tripathi W/o Abhishek Tripathi Aged About 39 Years R/o Avinash Count, Sector-30, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.), Other Address Work Place Aparna Tripathi, Principal, Krishna Public School, Indraprastha Colony, Sarona, Raipur (C.G.)

--- Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner(s) : None

For Respondent(s) : None

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J.)

Order on Board

21/07/2026

1. None for the petitioners on repeated calls and no representation is made.
2. Since no one appears on behalf of the parties on repeated calls and no representation is made, the writ petitions are dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE

Sumit