

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**W.P. No. 4316 of 2006**

1. Sonu Ram, S/o Mitthu Ram Gond
2. Maharo Bai, wife of Amar Singh Raout
3. Jug Bai, D/o Lachchhu Ram Gond

All R/o Village Gitpahar Patwari Halka No. 14, Tahsil Charanam,
District – Kanker (C.G.)

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Revenue Department, DKS Bhawan, Raipur.
2. Collector, Kanker, District Kanker
3. Babu Lal, through LRs.

3A. Srimati Sarita, widow of Babulal, aged about 45 years,

3B. Arun, son of Babulal, aged about 25 years,

Both residents of village Gitpahar, Tahsil Charama, District Kanker (C.G.)

---- **Respondents****And****W.P. No. 4110 of 2006**

1. Vishnu Ram, S/o Kalinder Raout
2. Johan Ram, S/o Dukal Gond

Both R/o Village Gitpahar Patwari Halka No. 14, Tahsil Charama, District Kanker (C.G.)

---- **Petitioner****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through the Secretary, Revenue Department, DKS Bhawan, Raipur.
2. Collector, Kanker, District Kanker
- 3A. Smt. Jana Bai, widow of Keju Ram, aged about 65 years,

- 3B. Puskar, S/o Keju Ram, aged about 42 years,
 3C. Perma Ram, son of Keju Ram, aged about 40 years,
 3D. Purushottam, son of Keju Ram, aged about 38 years,

All R/o Village Gitpahar Tahsil Charama, District Kanker
 (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Vishnu Kosta, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Aditya Sharma, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

28/07/2017

(1) Learned counsel appearing for the parties would submit that these writ petitions are squarely covered with the order passed by coordinate bench of this Court in W.P. No.4111 of 2006 decided on 16.02.2007 {**Surja Bai & others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others**), in which this Court has held as under:-

“13. Resultantly, the petitioner is partly allowed. The matter shall be duly enquired into by the competent authority on the basis of records of the case. All relevant material, recommendation of the gram panchayat, procedure of allotment, suitability and desirability, depending upon the extent of land held by individual applicants of the case, shall be taken into consideration.

14. Before parting with the matter, I must also place on record serious allegations by respondent No. 3 that though huge chunk of land was available for allotment to the applicants and 81 persons who were found eligible, the authority chosen to allot the land only in favour of about 35 persons. The records examined by me do not show reasons for not allotting land to eligible persons. There are allegations that other lands which were

encroached upon were not allotted because influential and powerful people are illegally occupying the land.”

(2) In view of above, the writ petitions stand finally disposed of in terms of para 13 & 14 of the order passed by this Court in W.P. No.4111 of 2006 on 16.02.2007 {**Surja Bai & others** (supra)}. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-