

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

REVP No. 82 of 2016

- M/s Stylo Wear Private Limited , Through Its Director Om Prakash Agrawal, S/o Late Shri R.R. Agrawal, Aged About 63 Years, R/o 'Om Kutir', Civil Line, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Lalit Kumar Singhania S/o Late Shri Jeevanlal Ji Singhania, Aged About 64 Years R/o “Manjusha”, 15/480, Civil Lines, Raipur, Police Station Gol Bazar, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh (Petitioner)
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Collector, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Nazul Officer, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue), Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
6. Tahsildar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
7. Nazul Tahsildar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant	Mr. Saurabh Sharma, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	Mr. Sumesh Bajaj, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Mr. P.K. Bhaduri, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra
Order On Board

13/5/2016

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that in the garb of the order dated 03.12.2015 passed by this

Court in WPC No.1600 of 2015, the State Authorities is proceeding ahead to demarcate the land belonging to the applicant. He would submit that if the applicant is dispossessed, he shall suffer irreparable loss, because, the order has been passed without impleading or hearing him.

3. A reading of the order passed in WPC No.1600 of 2015 would indicate that the writ petitioner was granted lease of 3.30 acres of land on 10.08.1987. An area admeasuring 0.536 acres out of the land leased area was not handed over to the writ petitioner, therefore, a direction was sought by him for demarcation and handing over possession.
4. The present applicant has not called in question the lease granted to the writ petitioner at any point of time. The right of the writ petitioner flows from the lease dated 10.08.1987. If the present applicant was aggrieved by the said lease on the ground that it covers any land belonging to him, the applicant may be required to agitate the matter at some other forum but not by way of this Review Petition. Learned counsel for the applicant has failed to point out any error apparent on the face of the record.
5. For the foregoing, there is no substance in the Review Petition, it fails and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Shyna