

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 2637 of 2017**

1. Rajesh Gupta, S/o H. P. Gupta, aged about 44 years, through Power of Attorney Holder namely Rakesh Gupta R/o Choubey Colony, In front of Rajkumar Colony, Sunita Chemicals, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.)
 2. Rakesh Gupta, S/o H. P. Gupta, aged about 42 years, through Power of Attorney Holder namely Rakesh Gupta R/o Choubey Colony, In front of Rajkumar Colony, Sunita Chemicals, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.)
 3. Smt. Sunita Gupta, W/o H. P. Gupta, aged about 57 years, R/o Choubey Colony, In front of Rajkumar Colony, Sunita Chemicals, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.)
- Petitioners**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Revenue Department Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
 2. Bochasanvasi Shri Akshar Purushottam Sanstha Sarvajanic Dharmarth Sahibag, Ahmedabad, Gujarat.
 3. Commissioner, Raipur Division, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
 4. The Collector, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
 5. Tahsildar, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
- Respondents**

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****18/06/18**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the substantive objection raised by the petitioners with regard to the mutation application has been rejected by the Tahsildar, Raipur by its interim order on untenable grounds, aggrieved against which this writ petition has been preferred by the petitioners.
2. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners, it appears that by

interim order the learned Tahsildar has postponed the decision on preliminary objection filed by the petitioner at the time of final hearing and the Review authorities have dismissed the appeal / rejection filed by the petitioners. I do not find jurisdictional error in the impugned order. However, the Tahsildar will do well to consider the preliminary objection first at the time of final hearing while finally deciding the application filed by the other side.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed with above-stated observation.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge