

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 4344 OF 2019**

• Yogendra Kumar Tamboli, S/o Late Rampyare Tamboli, aged about 40 years, R/o Village Sakreli (Baradwar), Police Station Baradwar, Tahsil Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa (CG) **... Petitioner**

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through: Secretary, Department of Revenue, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (CG)
2. Collector, District Janjgir-Champa (CG)
3. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue)-cum-Competent Authority, National Highway No.200 (New No.49), Champa, District Janjgir-Champa (CG)
4. National Highways Authority of India, through Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, National Road Area, Raipur, District Raipur (CG) **... Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Govind Dewangan, Advocate.
For Respondent 1, 2 & 3	:	Mr. Ayaz Naved, Govt. Advocate.
For Respondents 4	:	Mr. Naveen Shukla, Advocate, under instructions of Mrs. Fouzia Mirza, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

29/11/2019

1. Claim of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for grant of appropriate compensation for the land belonging to the petitioner, bearing Khasra No. 1256/1, Rakba 0.016 hectare, Patwari Halka No.16, situated at Village Sakreli (Baradwar), Tahsil Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa, which has been acquired by the respondents for the purpose of widening of National Highway No.200 (New No.49).
2. According to the petitioner, for the acquired land, the respondents have paid compensation applying the multiplier of 1, whereas, a Division Bench of this High Court in WPC No. 1649/2017 (Smt. Anita Agrawal vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others) and other analogous writ petitions, decided on 30.10.2018, has allowed the said writ petitions and directed the State authorities for considering grant of compensation applying the multiplier of 2.
3. While disposing of the said bunch of writ petitions on 30.10.2018, the Division Bench had observed that the compensation applying the multiplier of 2 has to be paid to all such persons whose land has been acquired and should not be confined only to the petitioners alone. Therefore, the petitioner herein has filed the present writ petition claiming for grant of proper compensation.

4. The respondents, however, have already filed a review petition, i.e. Review Petition No. 190/2019, against the said order dated 30.10.2018 passed in WPC No. 1649/2017 and the said review petition is listed for hearing on 12.12.2019 for final disposal.

5. According to the State Counsel, any benefit that the petitioner would have, would be only subject to the outcome of the said review petition and as such the petitioner till the said review petition is not decided would not be entitled for multiplier as claimed for by him.

6. Given the aforesaid facts, the present writ petition is also being disposed of in terms of the order dated 30.10.2018 passed in WPC No. 1649/2017 and other analogous writ petitions filed together, subject to the outcome of Review Petition No. 190/2019.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

/sharad/

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE