

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (C) No. 1430 of 2013**

Shri Chandra Vastrakar, S/o. Late Shri Mani Ram Vashtrakar, aged about 58 years, Occupation Govt. Servant, R/o. D/112, HTPS Korba, P.S. Darri, West Colony, Korba, Civil and Revenue District Korba (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Bank of India, Main Branch Korba, through : Its Branch Manager, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)
2. Satya Construction, "Sagar Deep Enclave" Near Uslapur, Railway Crossing Mungeli road, Ameri, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Additional Tahsildar, Sakri, Sub Tahsil Sakri, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Respondents.

Writ Petition (C) No. 1431 of 2013

Parmanand Pandey, S/o Shri M.P. Pandey, aged about 58 years, Occupation Govt. Servant, R/o. D/87, HTPS Korba, P.S. Darri, West Korba, Civil & Revenue District Korba (C.G.)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Bank of India, Main Branch Korba, through : Its Branch Manager, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)
2. Satya Construction, "Sagar Deep Enclave" Near Uslapur, Railway Crossing Mungeli road, Ameri, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. Additional Tahsildar, Sakri, Sub Tahsil Sakri, District Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- Respondents.

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Bharat Rajput, Advocate.
For Respondent No. 1	:	Mr. Abhishek Sinha, Advocate.
For State	:	Mr. Avinash Singh, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

25/07/2018

1. Since common question of law and fact is involved in both the writ petition, they are being heard together and are disposed of by this common order.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that impugned notice issued by the respondent No. 3- Additional Tahsildar is unsustainable and bad in law.
3. On the other hand, counsel for the respondents would submit that the petitioner may file reply to the said notice, the same will be considered and decided in accordance with law.
4. Be that as it may, since notice has been issued for recovery of the amount, the petitioners are at liberty to file reply to the notice within a period of four weeks from today. In the eventuality of filing of reply to the notice, the competent authority shall consider and decide the said objection/reply strictly in accordance with law expeditiously preferably within a period of four weeks from the receipt thereof.
5. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petitions stand finally disposed of.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)

Judge

D/-

