

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPC No. 750 of 2020**

1. Chandrabhushan @ Nanhi Ram Giri S/o Late Puran Giri Aged About 45 Years Caste Gosai R/o Village Kapu, Police Station Kapu, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
2. Laxmi Bai Wd/o Late Indrabhushan Giri Aged About 45 Years Caste Gosai R/o Village Kapu, Police Station Kapu, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Disaster Management, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar New Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Collector District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer (R) Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh
4. Tahsildar Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. Maa Dokri Dai Shishu Kalyan Samiti Kapu Through Its President, Kapu, Police Station Kapu, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Govind Dewangan, Advocate
For State	:	Ms. Sunita Jain, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****26/02/2020**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order of the State Government Annexure P-1 dated 09.07.2008. Vide the said order the State Government had given a lease of land bearing Khasra No.191/1 measuring 0.158 Hectare situated at Village Kapu, Patwari Halka No.8, Tahsil Dharamjaigarh, District Raigarh.
2. Contention of the petitioner is that it is only recently that petitioner came to know about the lease being given in favour of the

respondent No.5 and therefore they have filed the writ petition at this juncture.

3. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that writ petition suffers from inordinate delay and laches. It is settled position of law that writ petition at a belated stage should not be entertained. In the instant case the order under challenge is one which was passed 12 years back. Twelve year is a considerable long period for any person to approach the writ Court for challenging the order. In the instant case what also reflects is that the order dated 09.07.2008 has further been acted upon and revenue records have also been corrected to the extent of the name of respondent No.5 being entered in the records as allottees of the said land.
4. Given the facts, this Court is reluctant to entertain the writ petition at this juncture. Accordingly, the writ petition stands rejected on the ground of delay and laches.
5. Our reluctance to entertain the writ petition would not preclude the petitioner from availing other remedies if any open to him under law.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge