

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CONT No. 882 of 2018

Ramkhilawan, S/o. Late Rikhiram Sahu, Aged About 76 Years, Mukam
Post Bodsara, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner In Person

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Durgeshchandra Mishra, Rajsava Sachiv, Chhattisgarh Shasan Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Nidhi Chhibbar, Tatkalin Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
3. Shri M.R. Sarthi, Tatkalin Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. Shri B.L. Tiwari, Tatkalin Collector, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh.
5. Shri Sukumar Chand, Tatkalin Additional & Prabhari Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
6. Shri A.K. Tiwari, Tatkalin Additional Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
7. Shri Ashutosh Singh Kushvaha, Government Advocate, High Court Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
8. Shri N.D. Tigala, Additional Registrar General, High Court Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
9. Shri Brajesh Chandra Mishra, Tatkalin Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
10. Shri O.P. Choudhari, Tatkalin Collector, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
11. Shri Santosh Gupta, Sub Divisional Officer, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

Petitioner In Person : Mr. Ramkhilawan

For State : Mr. D.R.Minj, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board

27.08.2018

1. Petitioner in person submits that he has not been given entire possession of the land in question.
2. Perusal of the record would show that initially in a Writ Petition No.1414/2002, this Court by an order dated 16.04.2003 had directed the State official to decide the representation if filed within a period of four months. Subsequently, when the same was not

decided, the Contempt Petition No.109/2003 was filed wherein further two months time extension was given to decide the representation by an order dated 04.12.2003. Subsequently, the contempt petition was finally heard on 01.02.2011 and the Court observed that within the extended period of time of two months, the Collector has decided the representation of the petitioner on 17.02.2004. It was further observed that the Court did not direct the authority to decide the representation in a particular manner.

3. Under the facts of this case, if the petitioner is still aggrieved, he could have assailed his remedy in an appropriate forum. As has been stated by the petitioner that he has not been given the entire possession of the land cannot be gone into this contempt. The petitioner, if so advised, may avail his remedy before the appropriate forum.
4. Accordingly, the petition is misconceived and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge