

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPURWPS No. 3821 of 2018

1. Trilochan Sahu S/o Late Charan Sahu, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Motipur, Ward No. 3, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
2. Parasram S/o Late Shomusingh, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Station Para, Ward No. 12, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
3. Smt. Bhagbati Dewangan W/o Late B. Dewangan, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Durga Chowk, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
4. Afzal Ali S/o Late Ahmed Ali, Aged About 67 Years, Station Para, Ward No. 12, Chikhali, P.S. Chikhli, Rajnandgaon, Tahsil And District- Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

---Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Department Of Urban Administration And Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Directorate Urban Administration And Development, Through- The Director, Urban Administration And Development, Indrawati Bhawan, Capital Complex, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Municipal Corporation Rajnandgaon, Through- Its Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Rajnandgaon, District- Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For petitioners	:	Shri Somkant Verma, Advocate.
For respondent No.3	:	Shri Sourabh Sharma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

18/05/2018

1. The counsel for the petitioners submits that, in the light of order passed by this Court in the case of **Murlidhar Hariharno v. State of**

Chhattisgarh & Ors. (WPS No.4640/1999 decided on 04/08/2017), the case of the petitioner was also processed and a resolution also has been passed by the Municipal Corporation, Rajnandgaon, but the same has not been given effect to.

2. Perusal of record would show that, the decision/resolution of the respondent corporation have been passed on 10/01/2018 and the order has also been passed by the Municipal Corporation, Rajnandgaon on 15/02/2018.

3. In the given facts this Court is of the opinion that since the case of the petitioner is already under process, no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the Writ Petition pending.

4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed off with a direction to the petitioner to make a detailed representation to the respondent No.3 who in turn may decide the representation or in the alternative ensure the compliance of the order dated 15/02/2018 meanwhile.

5. It is expected that the respondent No.3 shall take a prompt decision on such representation being made preferably within a period of 2 months from the date of receipt of representation.

6. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed off.

Sd/-

(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE