

CT 700

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR (CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION NO. 4011 OF 2003

PETITIONERS

- : 1. Shatrughan Lal Dewangan, son of Shri Motiram Dewangan, aged about 34 years, resident of Chhurikalan, Tehsil-Katghora, District-Korba, (C.G.)
- : 2. Dayaram Netam, son of Ram Charan Netam, aged about 36 years, resident of Ayodhyapuri, Jalgaon, Tehsil-Katghora, District-Korba, (C.G.)
- : 3. Shivnandan Prasad Shriwas, son of Ramdhar Shriwas, aged about 42 years, resident of Tehsil-Katghora, District-Korba, (C.G.), R/O. Q. No. 780, Block-3 Yamuna Vihar, Post - Jannipali.
- : 4. Dhaneshwar Prasad Soni, son of Dadu Lal Soni, aged about 35 years, resident of Chhurikala, Tehsil Katghora, District-Korba, (C.G.)
- : 5. Vishwanath Dewangan, son of Santuram Dewangan, aged about 32 yrs. resident of Village Chhurikalan, District-Korba, (C.G.)
- : 6. Laxmi Narayan Jaiswal, son of Ram Bahor Jaiswal, aged about 38 years, resident of Village-Chaitma, Tehsil-Pali, District-Korba, (C.G.)
- : 7. Bhagwat Prasad Patel, son of Dadu Ram Patel, aged about 44 years resident of Village-Jannipali, District-Korba, (C.G.)

P.R. No. 3269/03
Presented by Shri Smt. Anil Kumar
dated 29.1.03

RECEIVED
28/1/03
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

- : 1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Department of Health and Family Welfare, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya, Raipur, (C.G.)
- : 2. Chhattisgarh Ayurvedic and Unani System of Medicine and Naturopathy Board, through its Registrar, Raipur, (C.G.)



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA :

1. PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONERS :

As per cause title.

...2..

235
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WP No. 4011 of 2003

- Shatrughan Lal Dewangan and ors.

---- Petitioner

Versus

- The State Of Chhattisgarh & anr.

---- Respondent

None for the petitioner even in the second round.
Shri Manish Nigam, Panel Lawyer for the State.
Ms. Anubhuti Marhas, counsel for respondent No.2.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

09/01/2017

It is an old matter.

Despite repeated calls, no appearance is being made on behalf of the petitioners.

This petition was earlier dismissed for want of prosecution and later on, on application for restoration, the same was restored. However, thereafter, again no representation has been made. Therefore, this Court is left with no option but to dismiss the petition for want of prosecution.

Accordingly, this petition is dismissed for want of prosecution.

Sd/-
Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Judge