

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No.3817 of 2019

Jagjeet Singh S/o Budhram Aged 35 Years Caste Mar, R/o Village Murka, Tahsil Shankargarh, Police Station Shankargarh, District Balrampur-Ramnujganj Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Panchayat and Gramin Vikas Vibhag, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Capital Complex, Atal Nagar Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Commissioner Surguja Division District Surguja Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector Balrampur Ramanujganj, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
4. Sub Divisional Officer Revenue Kusmi, Tahsil Kusmi, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.
5. Anoop Kumar Singh S/o Ramsundar Singh Aged About 27 Years Caste Mar, R/o Village Murka, Patwari Halka No. 8 Shankargar, Tahsil Shankargarh, District Balrampur Ramanujganj Chhattisgarh.

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Vikas Pandey, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Jitendra Pali, Dy. Advocate General.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

07.11.2019

1. Challenge in the present Writ Petition is to the order dated 14.03.2019 whereby the domicile certificate issued in favour of the petitioner has been cancelled.
2. Perusal of record would show that the petitioner, on the basis of the domicile certificate, got employment as Rozgar Sahayak. Subsequently, one Anoop Kumar Singh had lodged a complaint before the Tehsildar in respect of the fake domicile certificate that the petitioner has obtained and an enquiry was conducted, evidences were recorded and the petitioner as well as the Objector were both called upon to substantiate their case.
3. Perusal of record would further reveal that the witnesses appeared before the Naib Tehsildar and have stated that there was no property belonging to the petitioner available at Village Murka or in the name of any of his

ancestors or forefathers to establish that he was resident of village Murka. Likewise, it was also found that the petitioner himself was infact residing at Village Kamari. In addition to this, the petitioner has not been able to produce any of the records by which it could be established that he has been residing at Village Murka since long which enabled him to obtain domicile certificate.

4. Given the aforesaid evidences that have been produced before the Naib Tehsildar and also the fact that the petitioner has not been able to produce any cogent document to hold that the findings of the Naib Tehsildar was bad or incorrect, this court does not find any strong case made out by the petitioner calling for an interference with the impugned order at this juncture.
5. The writ petition thus fails and is accordingly rejected.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

inder