

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1095 of 2018**

1. Om Prakash Dani S/o Late Pram Lal Dani, aged about 59 years, R/o Banbarad, Tahsil Dhamdha, District Durg (C.G.)
2. Sunil Dani, S/o Late Prem Lal Dani, aged about 47 years, R/o Banbarad, Tahsil Dhamdha, District Durg (C.G.)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh Prantiya Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Dayanand Parisar, Arya Nagar, Durg, Tahsil and District Durg (C.G.)
2. Chhattisgarh Revenue Board Bilaspur, through President, Office at Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Additional Collector, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)
4. Additional Tahsildar, Ahiwara, Tahsil Dhamdha, District Durg (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Praveen Dhurandhar, Advocate.
For Respondents/ State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****18/04/18**

1. This writ petition has been preferred by the petitioners being aggrieved by the order of Board of Revenue whereby, the Board of Revenue has rejected the revision petition filed by the petitioners affirming the order of Additional Collector dated 15.10.2015 and that of the Tahsildar dated 13.07.2015.
2. By order dated 13.07.2015, Tahsildar has closed the Case No. 59/A-74/2014-15 pending between the parties on the ground that this Court has granted the interim order on 25.03.2015 in First Appeal No. 198 of 2014; *Om Prakash Dani & Ors. v. Arya Pratinidhi Sabha & Ors.* The order passed by

the Tahsildar was challenged before the Additional Collector in revision. The Additional Collector, by its order dated 15.10.2015 has rejected the revision on the ground that revision is not maintainable as this Court has already granted interim order and Tahsildar has disposed of the application on the basis of the interim order passed by this Court.

3. Therefore, the order passed by the three authorities are strictly in accordance with law and on the basis of order passed by this Court, the order has been passed by the Revenue Authorities. As such, I do not find any jurisdictional error in the impugned order.

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

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)

Judge