

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 450 of 2014

1. Gangadhar Patel S/o Chetan Patel Aged About 52 Years R/o Tilgi, P.S. Pusour, Distt. Raigarh C.G.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. K.S. Mandavi S/o Sub Divisional Officer Cum Land Acquisition Officer, Raigarh, Distt. Raigarh C.G.

---- Respondent

For Petitioner.
For Respondent.

: Shri Manoj Kumar Sinha, Advocate.
: Shri Raghvendra Pradhan, Advocate.

Order On Board

04/09/2015

Heard.

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that despite order passed by this Court on 08.07.2014 in the writ petition, till date amount of compensation has not been paid though according to the petitioner, he was entitled to compensation in respect of land and tree.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent referred to averments made in the return and submits that as far as SDO is concerned, according to him, the petitioner is entitled for compensation for reasons that the Tube-well of the petitioner is included in the land which included under the land acquisition proceedings. He wrote a letter to the concerned Executive Engineer to deposit the amount of compensation for payment to the petitioner.
3. The conduct of the respondent does not show that he has acted in willful disobedience of the order of this Court. He has already forwarded the proposal to the

Executive Engineer for payment of compensation to the petitioner. Now it is for the Executive Engineer to take steps to deposit the amount of the compensation with the land Acquisition Officer to the extent of claim directed by the Land Acquisition Officer.

4. Let a copy of this order be submitted before the concerned Executive Engineer who shall take appropriate steps in the spirit of order of this Court passed on 08.07.2014 to ensure payment of compensation to the petitioner at the earliest on the basis of proposal of the Land Acquisition Officer.

5. If it is not done within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of copy of this order which is now being passed, this Court would be constrained to initiate proceeding against the concerned executive Engineer. As far as other claim of the petitioner is concerned, for that the petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate remedy as available to him under the law.

6. Accordingly, the petition is disposed off.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Judge