

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 620 of 2018**

Smt. Meena Baid, W/o. Gautam Baid, aged about 59 years, R/o. Sadar Bazar, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari, Through the Power of Attorney Holder Dharam Chand Baid, R/o. Sadar Bazar, Dhamtari, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Vikas Agrawal, S/o. Bihari Lal Agrawal, aged about 37 years,
2. Manish Kumar Agrawal, S/o. Bihari Lal Agrawal, aged about 38 years,
Both R/o. Gujrati Colony, Dhamtari, Distt. Dhamtari (C.G.)
3. Bhaiya Ram, S/o. Bohram Sinha, aged about 47 years, R/o. Village Gurur, Tahsil and Distt. Balod (C.G.)
4. Revenue Inspector, Revenue Inspector Circle Bhothli, Tahsil and Distt. Dhamtari (C.G.)
5. The Collector, Dhamtari, Distt. Dhamtari (C.G.)
6. Kile Ke Shri Hanuman Mandir, Through the Secretary, Tahsil and Distt. Dhamtari (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Vinod Kumar Sharma, Advocate.
For Respondents/State : Shri Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Order On Board

15/03/2018

(1) In an application filed by respondents No.1 & 2 namely Vikas Agrawal and Manish Agrawal for demarcation of their land before the Tahsildar, the said authority conducted demarcation and passed order dated 12.05.2014, against which, petitioner preferred appeal and revision before the Collector, Commissioner and Board of Revenue, respectively. All the three revenue authorities have dismissed the appeal and revision, against which instant writ petition has been filed questioning the same.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order passed by the Board of Revenue is bad and unsustainable in law.

(3) Per contra, counsel for the State would support the impugned order.

(4) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.

(5) All the three revenue authorities i.e. Collector, Commissioner and Board of Revenue have concurrently held that the demarcation made by the Tahsildar is strictly in accordance with law, which is based on material available on record. I do not find any illegality in the order impugned warranting interference by this Court in the instant writ petition.

(6) Accordingly, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-