

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 408 of 2017

Baljit Kaur W/o Karam Singh, Aged About 60 Years R/o Flat No. B-2, 303 Shriram Lotus Vally, Tatibandh, District Raipur Chhattisgarh. Through Attorney Surendra Singh, S/o Karam Singh Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

Jageshwar Kaushal Tehsildar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

CONT No. 389 of 2017

Harpal Singh S/o Lakhveer Singh, Aged About 40 Years R/o Panchdham Mandir, Near Mahaveer Apartment, Udaya Society, Tatibandh, Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Petitioner

Versus

Jageshwar Kaushal Tehsildar Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

---- Respondent

CONT No. 431 of 2017

Sayad Anwar Ali S/o Ahmed Ali Aged About 50 Years (Wrongly Mentioned In Order As 60 Years), R/o Ravi Nagar, Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

Jageshwar Kaushal Tehsildar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

And

CONT No. 391 of 2017

Lakhveer Singh S/o Buxis Singh, Aged About 65 Years R/o Panchdham Mandir, Near Mahaveer Apartment, Udaya Society, Tatibandh, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

Jageshwar Kaushal Tehsildar Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

Shri Shailendra Kumar Bajpai, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Akhilesh Kumar, counsel for the respondent.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

25/09/2017

All these contempt petitions have been filed by the petitioners who are aggrieved by non-compliance of the order of the Court directing demarcation to be made.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent has come out with the reply that though belatedly, demarcation has been carried out. Referring to the aforesaid averments made in the reply, it is submitted that because of lapse on the part of the ministerial staff, the order of the Court was not brought to the notice of the Additional Tahsildar who was required to be carried out demarcation. For that lapse, disciplinary action is proposed against the erring ministerial staff.

3. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and the explanation offered by the respondent, I am inclined to close these matters by discharging the rule. Rule is accordingly discharged. Contempt petitions are closed, however, with liberty to the respective petitioners to challenge the demarcation report, if they are aggrieved, in a separately constituted proceedings as may be available to them under the law.

Sd/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge