

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2131 of 2018**

D.K.Kosle S/o Late Bharat Lal Kosle, Aged About 37 Years Posted As Assistant Superintendent Of Land Record, R/o Nutan Chowk Sarkanda, P.S. Sarkanda, Tahsil And District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mahanadi Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, Post Office, Police Station Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Commissioner, Bilaspur Division, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh
3. Collector (Land Records), Mungeli, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh, District : Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
4. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Mungeli, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh, District : Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
5. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Pathariya, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh, District : Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
6. Tahsildar Mungeli, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh, District : Mungeli, Chhattisgarh
7. Tahsildar, Pathariya, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh, District : Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	:	Mr. Shashank Thakur, G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****07/03/18**

1. By this instant writ petition the orders/memo dated 3.10.2017 and 31.10.2017 (Annexures P/1 and P/2 respectively) issued by respondents No.

6 and 7 addressing to all the Patwaris of Tahsil Mungeli and Pathariya have been called in question by the petitioner who is working on the post of Assistant Superintendent Land Records (ASLR), Bilaspur.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that certain powers conferred under the provisions of the Chhattisgarh Land Revenue Code, 1959 (for brevity 'CGLRC') upon the Superintendent Land Records (SLR) and Assistant Superintendent Land Records (ASLR) by the State Government relating to mutation proceedings have been taken by the said impugned orders and only instructions have been issued to the Revenue Inspectors for disposal of mutation applications. He would further submit that the impugned orders passed are contrary to the provisions of CGLRC and deserves to be set aside.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the State would oppose the submissions made by learned counsel for petitioner and support the order impugned.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the impugned orders with utmost circumspection.

5. On careful perusal, it appears that by the said order certain directions have been issued to the Revenue Inspectors to inform the Tahsildar about the leave application filed by the patwaris of his jurisdiction and forward it for appropriate action, therefore I do not find any merit in the writ petition.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition deserves to be and is hereby dismissed. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge