

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 190 of 2012**

1. Dinesh Gupta S/o Sukhdev Prasad Gupta, aged about 60 years, R/o Nandai, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (CG)
2. Kamlesh Gupta S/o Sukhdev Prasad Gupta, aged about 58 years, R/o Nandai, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (CG)
3. Mahesh Gupta S/o Sukhdev Prasad Gupta, aged about 50 years, R/o Nandai, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (CG)
4. Rajeshwari Gupta, Wd/o late Ramchandra Gupta, aged about 60 years, R/o Nandai, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (CG)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Revenue Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh
3. Tahsildar, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****10.05.2018**

The challenge in the present writ petition was to the action on the part of the respondents in issuing a notice dated 01.12.2011 for demolition of the portion of shops adjacent to the residential house of the petitioners.

2. Pending the petition before this Court, the respondents have now come up with a reply where they have made a statement in paragraph- 14 as response to paragraphs - 8.6 to 8.9 of the writ petition, that they have

already removed the illegal construction made by the petitioners on the public road. It has been further reiterated in reply that if any further action is required in respect of the constructions made in plot no.111, they will take further action only after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

3. Given the aforesaid submission made in their reply and the fact that the encroachment and illegal construction made by the petitioners having been removed by the respondents, nothing further as of now remains to be adjudicated in the present writ petition. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of. Needless to mention that the petitioners would have the liberty to challenge the subsequent action, if any, initiated by the respondents contrary to law.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**