

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 574 of 2020**

Gangaram @ Lakhan S/o Chamara Aged About 70 Years R/o Village Baraud, Tahsil Gharghoda, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Union Of India Through Under Secretary To Government Of India, Ministry Of Coal, Office At New Delhi
2. South Eastern Coalfield Limited, Through Managing Director, Office At Seepat Road, Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.
3. Area Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Limited, Raigarh Area, Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.
4. Sub Area Manager, South Eastern Coalfield Limited, Baroud Sub Area, Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.
5. Collector, Raigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Revenue, Gharghoda , District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.
7. Miniketan S/o Ugrasen, Caste Sodi, R/o Village Baraud, Tahsil Gharghoda, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
8. Devbrat S/o Chanter Singh, Caste Jat, R/o House No. 2137, Archana Estate, Jind (Haryana).

----Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri N.K. Chatterjee, Adv.
For Respondents No. 2 to 4	: Shri Sudhir Kumar Bajpai, Adv.
For State/Respondents No. 5 & 6	: Ms. Abhyunnati Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/02/2020**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is for non granting of compensation and other benefits as per Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.
2. Perusal of the records would show that the compensation for the said land has already been paid to the respondents No. 7 & 8. It is this action which the petitioner intends to challenge.

3. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion, that the writ petition for resolving the said dispute at this juncture would not be maintainable. There are highly disputed question of facts involved in the case and for resolving the same, it would require evidence both oral and documentary. The same can only be got adjudicated upon before the competent Civil Court and not before the writ Court.
4. In view of the same, this Court is of the opinion that, the writ petition would not be maintainable and the same therefore stands dismissed. Reserving the right of the petitioner to avail other remedies open for the petitioner.
5. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge